50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 9:00 having arrived, the House will be in Session. Members will be at their Chair. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Richard H. Brady, Pastor of Grace Daptist Church Academy of Springfield. Pastor Brady is a guest of Representative Karen Hasara. The guests in the Gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation. Reverend Brady."

Reverend Brady: "Father, we thank You this morning that we can begin this day in our Session and acknowledging You, coming directly to You, we are thankful that we have the freedoms country to call upon our God. And we ask this in this morning, particularly, that You give wisdom to these as our lawmakers, we know they need wisdom today. We know they'll be voting, discussion. Perhaps some areas, very critical areas. We would pray that You would give each of them a special wisdom as they represent this State to vote not the people οf only their convictions, but that which is right and we trust that which would please Thee. He thank Thee for the freedoms that You have given to us. We pray that through this Body, these freedoms may be maintained and sustained during these days of decision making. We thank You that we can look tο We thank You that You have laws. We thank You that Thee You have made these laws available to us. And decisions today in these weeks, in these Sessions, reflect, we trust, the morality and the convictions and the freedoms You would have us to have as lawmakers. So, we thank Thee today for this day. Give wisdom again, we prav. each one. May we glorify You, and we thank You for this because we ask it in Jesus' name. Amen."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, to lead us in the Pledge to the Flag."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Ropp: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Hr. Matijevich are there any excused absences on the Democratic side?"
- Matijevich: "Good morning. None on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel are there any excused absences on the Republican side?"
- Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the record show Representative

  Tuerk is excused today for medical reasons. And also ..."
- Speaker Greiman: "What's his condition today?"
- Piel: "Current update. The doctor has got him walking about 400 feet, 4 times a day. Fred is in very good spirits. He hopes to be out of the hospital by the first part of next week, he is hoping by Friday or Saturday. But let's say the first part of next week. And also ..."
- Speaker Greiman: "He's walking 400 feet a day? That's more than most of the Members who are here."
- Piel: "Four times a day. That's true. That's true. And one thing he wanted to convey to everybody, that the medicine that we send him in our cards, letters and the flowers and everything, he said was the best medicine he could have had. He really appreciated it. In fact probably one of the best ones was the one Ar. Van Duyne sent him dealing with something that Van Duyne didn't know he had any heart, or something like that. He said he really got a laugh out of that one."
- Speaker Greiman: "Let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Tuerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 Members having answered to the call of a quorum, a quorum is present. Messages from the Senate."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, T am directed to inform the House o f Representatives the Senate has passed Bills the following title. The passage of which I am instructed t o of the House of Representatives, to wit: concurrence Senate Bills 20, 23, 132, 208, 240, 277, 278, 282. 298. 350, 372, 379, 382, 333, 384, 387, 339, 390, 403, 404, 405, 410. 411. 419. 440. 441. 448. 449. 450. 457. 458. 460. 461. 465. 466. 467. 472. 476. 481. 482. 486. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492, 493, 495, 502, 508, 531, 545, 546, 548, 549, 553, 557, 582, 585, 587, 596, 609, 616, 617, 618, 635, 637, 639, 641, 642, 643, 644, 646, 653, 667, 668, 670, 682, 684, 690, 695, 707. 731. 752. 759. 766. 769. 779. 780. 781. 788. 789. 792. 806. 808. 819. 826. 832. 346. 857. 892. 893. 894. 899. 904. 906. 908. 912. 913. 915. 916. 918. 921. 922. 923. 927. 928. 929, 930, 932, 933, 934, 936, 942, 945, 949, 950, 955, 956, 958. 959. 960, 961, 973, 991, 992, 993, 1006, 1012, 1018, 1025, 1031, 1037, 1040, 1046, 1051, 1052, 1073, 1085, 1095, 1096, 1109, 1119, 1122, 1132, 1146, 1156, 1172, 1178, 1183, 1201, 1222, 1223, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1232, 1233, 1241, 1255, 1258, 1261, 1266, 1267, 1285, 1290, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1293, 1300, 1302, 1304, 1308, 1316, 1318, 1320, 1322, 1325 • 1327 • 1358 • I'm sorry • 1356 • 1370 • 1390 • 1397 • 1399. 1403, 1409, 1410, 1412, 1432, 1438, 1439, 1453, 1454, 1461, 1467, 1472, 1483, 1484, 1480 ... 1493, 1494, 1515 and 1517, the Senate May 19, 1987. passed Linda Secretary. \*\*

Speaker Greiman: "Ladies and Sentlemen, we are going to now ask the Clerk to read the Bills that are on the Order of Consent Calendar, Appropriations, Third Reading. The Clerk will read those Bills, but we will not take a vote on these issues until later on during the day. So we will just be reading these Bills a third time now and not taking a vote

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

until later in the day. Ar. Clerk? On the Order of Appropriations, Consent Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bills.

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Appropriations, Third Reading, House Bill 109, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority Reconstruction Fund. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 416. a Bill for an Act making appropriations to State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 451, a Bill for an Act appropriating funds relation to Build Illinois Program. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 480. a Bill for Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 606, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 699, a Bill for making certain Appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill. 3i11 410 . Bi 11 for an Act making Third Reading of the Bill. Appropriations. House Bill 756, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for Ordinary and Contingent Expense of Prairie State 2000 Authority. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 757. for an Act making certain appropriations to the Bill Illinois Farm Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill. House 3111 758. a Bill for an Act reappropriations to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 759, Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council. Third Reading of the Sill. House Bill 760, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of State Employees Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 761, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

and Contingent Expense of Certain Retirement Ordinary Third Reading of the Bill. Systems. House Bill 762. for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Judges Retirement System. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 763, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the General Assembly Retirement System. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 764, a 3ill for making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Teachers Retirement System. Third Reading House of the Bill. Sill 765, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Public School Teachers' Pension Retirement Fund. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 766, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 768, a Bill for an appropriation for Act t a make an the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 769, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 771. a Bill an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Healthcare Cost Care Containment Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 772, a Bill for an Act to provide for the Ordinary and Contingent the Office of the Lieutenant Governor. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 774, a Bill for an Act make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Department of Lottery. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 775, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill. House 3ill 776, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of Third Reading of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Bill. House Bill 779, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Department of Employment Security. Third Reading House Bill 780 a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense n f the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 781. a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Third Reading of the House 782. Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for Bill the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Department Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 785, a Bill Aginga Act to make an appropriation to the Capital an Board. Third Reading of the Bill. Development House Bill 790, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation and Contingent Expense to the Department of Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill. House 3ill Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary Contingent Expense of the Department n f Local Government Law Enforcement Officers' Training Board. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 960, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Third Reading of the House Bill 1065, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation Ordinary and Contingent Expense to the Office of the State Appellate Offender. Third Reading of the Rill -House Bill 1163, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1234, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

House Bill 1368, a 3ill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Office of State Attorney Appellate Prosecutors. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1636. a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Supreme Court-Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act to appropriation to the various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2048, a Bill for an Act to appropriation to various Legislative an Agencies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act to provide for the Ordinary and Contingent Assembly. Third Reading of the Expense of the General Bill. House Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act to appropriation to the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2756, a Bill for an Act to make aп various agencies. Third Reading of the appropriation to Bills. First Reading. Bill. Senate Sanate Bill 208. McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Senate Bill 293, Kubik, a Bill for an Reading of the Bill. Act to amend the State Property Control Act. First) Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 350, Rea, a Bill for an Act in relation to Jurv Commissioners and Authorizing Judges to Appoint such Commissioners and to Make Rules containing the Powers and Duties. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 372, Black and Weaver, a Bill for an Act relating to Headsets for Drivers of Third (sic, First) Reading of the Bill. Bill 404, Black, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of in relation to Compensation of Sheriffs, Coroners, County Treasurers, County Clerks, Recorders and Auditors with their necessary Clerk Hire. First Reading of the Bill. Senate 3ill 457, Richmond, a Bill for an Act the Training Institutes of Municipal Clerks. to First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 489. (sic-Senate

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Bill) McCracken, a Bill for an Act concerning Grants Relative to Higher Education. First Reading of the House Bill 490. (sic-Senate Bill) AcCracken, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First the Bill. That's Senate Bills 489 and 490. Reading of Senate Bill 492, Hicks and McCracken, a Bill for an Act to the Radiation Protection Act. First Reading of the Senate Dill 493, Levin and Ryder, a Bill for an Act Bill. amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 546, Black, a Bill for an Act in Relation to Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 617, Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading o f the Senate Bill 769, Black, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act provide for grants to Local Governmental Units for the additional compensation of Law Enforcement Officers meeting certain educational standards. First Reading of the Senate Bill 788, Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the Soybean Marketing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 789, Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the Marketing Acto First Reading of the Eill. Senate Bill 806, Turner, Heaver and Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill the 819, Myron Olson and Flinn, a Bill for an Act relating Certain Powers and Duties of the Secretary First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 857. Ropp Bill for Act to amend the School Code. ลก First Reading of the Bill. Senate 3ill 916, Hicks Myron Olson, a Bill for an Act concerning Regulation of Fishing. Hunting and Trapping, amending certain Acts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 949. Breslin and Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 958, Hoffman, a Bill for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Sill 959, Capparelli, a Bi11 an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 960, Capparelli, for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Bill Senate Bill 961, Hoffman, Act. First Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act in relation to location of Pollution Control Facilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1006, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act tο of an Act in relation to Construction Operation Sections Regulation Maintenance for System Toll Highways create the Illinois Toll Highway Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1156, Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading o f Senate Bill 1172, Currie, a Bill for an Act to the Bille amend the Code of Civil Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1233. Klemm. a Bill for an Act to amend the Snow Mobile Registration and Safety Act. First Reading Senate Bill 1304, Countryman, a Bill of the Bill. the Personnel Code. First Reading of the Act to amend Senate Bill 1379, Flowers, a Bill for an Act Bill. tο the Criminal Code. First Reading amend αf the Bill. Senate Bill 1461, Rea, a Bill for an Act to amend the Act on the Aging. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1493, Hasara, a Bill for an Act Products Transportation Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1494. Hasara, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Timberbine License Act. First Reading ٥f the Bill. Senate Bills, First Reading on the Regular Calendar. Senate dill 48, Leverenz, a Bill for making appropriations to various State Agencies. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 49, Leverenz, a Bill an Act making appropriations for various State Agencies.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 286, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 363. Laverenz. a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense o f State Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill. 783, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act appropriation for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bil1 377. Rea and Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hannia. Illinois Farm Development Act. First Reading of the Senate 3ill 421, Hannig, Rea and Black, a 3ill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Ladies and Gentlemen. I would direct your pages attention to after page 52, there are 4 identified with Roman ... small ... Roman Numerals, which represent a Calendar Index and give you some illumination as page your Bill appears upon. So that, now, you can look at vour Bill in a ... in its numerical order, and in the Calendar Index, and it will advise you of the page upon which vour Bi11 appears. Α calendar improvement Yes, Mr. Cullerton, for what purpose do announcement. vou seek recognition?

Cullerton: "Yesa Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen House. Mr. Speaker, last night I made announcement having learned the results of the CUBS night. I made an announcement that the CUBS had temporarily taken over first place in their knowing full well that if the Cardinals had won last night that they would have gone back into first place. MON. haven't had a chance to see the paper this morning and I wondered if anyone ... maybe Representative Stephens might

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

know how the Cardinals did. I know they were ahead and I just wondered if he knew the results. Because if ... if they won, they would be back in first place and I'm sure he'd like to tell us about it."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Park, were you seeking recognition?"

Park: "Not on this issue."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Flinn, the Gentleman from St. Clair?"

Flinn: "Well, I can answer the Gentleman. Temporarily, the CUBS are in first place. But the June swoon has not started yet."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker. In defense of the State Bird, the Cardinal. I have to rise and tell you that the Cardinals happen to manage to wind up to come out behind in the game last night. But, we are just recovering from a11 n f injuries and Pena is on his our wav back. And we CUBS congratulate Harry Carey and the for winning We're glad Harry Carey is better Representative ... I couldn't improve on Representative Flinn's word ... the June swoon, I like that."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolfe?"
- Wolfe: "Yes. Thank you, Ar. Speaker. I would just like to add to that, that up to this point the Cardinals have been playing with their second team. The first team will start probably in the next couple of weeks. Then we'll find out what the score is."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Parke, now for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have copies of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Hars, Memorial Day speeches. I will be passing them out, so those of you that

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

would like to have a copy, I have three different speeches.

Just flag your ... let me know and I'll give you a copy of it. Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Mr. Steczo?"
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back on the order of baseball for just one moment. Representative Stephens indicated that the Cardinals were the State Bird. I think perhaps we should call Representative Satterthwaites. Bill back to Second Reading and make the CUBS the State Fossil."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ar. Steczo. I didn't know that Posen was South

  of Springfield. Mr. Countryman?"
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the order of baseball and basketball. I want you to know that I watched the basketball game with Representative Johnson last night. But in the middle of that the Cardinals lost the baseball game. And last we saw of him, he was leaving the sixteenth floor of the Lincoln Tower but not using the stairway or the elevator."
- Speaker Greiman: "With your permission we'll go to the regular Calendar on page 14, on the Order of Senior Citizens, House Bills, Second Reading. Mr. Turner? Mr. Turner? Out of the Record. Now on the Order of House Cills, Third Reading, Senior Citizens appears House Bill 1014. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman?"
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1014 is a technical clean up Bill. It deals with Lekoteck. Lekoteck is a Scandinavian word that refers to ... that means 'play libraries'. These are libraries for Disabled Children that circulate especially designed toys

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

that help these disabled children develop their motor skills and other physical skills. The problem is they're getting tired of calling themselves 'play libraries' and ... because it sounds frivolous and so the Bill basically makes the change that refers to these institutions as resource centers for disabled children and it's a technical clean up Bill, and I move for its passage."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Bowman, moves for the passage of House Bill 1014. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage. Mr. HcCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank ... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The new language does not imply increased responsibilities or costs. It's merely a new description of the existing program. Is that right?"
- Bowman: "Well it a ... That's basically it. There is some language in there that provides for continuing support as opposed to initial support for these organizations, but the Department is doing that anyway. And they have no objections to the Bill. And the Fiscal Note is zilch."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ar. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'ave', none voting \*no\* • none voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this Order appears House Bill 1848. Ar. Clerk, read the Bill. I'm sorry, Mr. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, has leave to handle this Bill and moves to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment. Have leave? Leave is granted. Hr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment arepsilon1, offered by Representative Preston."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. The Lady from Cook has leave to handle that. As. Currie, on Amendment #1."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The
  Amendment would exempt State Police from the end of
  Compulsory Retirement on grounds of age, so as to make this
  Bill, the underlying bill, House Bill 1848, consistent with
  other legislation that has been adopted by this Assembly."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves for the passage ...

  for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1848. And
  on that, there being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall
  Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor 'aye', opposed
  'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it.
  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Lady from Cook moves to suspend
  Rule 37(b) so that this matter may be heard in standard.

  Does the Lady have leave? She has leave. Hr. Clerk, read
  the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1848, a Bill for an Act concerning

  Compulsory Retirement. Third Reading of the Eill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill, House Bill 1848, would apply that provisions presently in Federal Law that prevent Compulsory Retirement on the grounds of age, would make sure that those provisions apply to State Employees, including our judges.

  I would appreciate your support for the Bill. Happy to answer questions. And would urge you to vote 'yes' on House Bill 1848, as amended."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 1848. And on that, is there any discussion?

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

There being none, the question is, 'Shall this 3ill pass?'

All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote
'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ar. Clerk, take
the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye',
none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. On this Order of Business appears House Bill 1902.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House 3ill 1902, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Living Will Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Ar. Curran, on House dill 1902."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this Bill ... I believe there is agreement with the Right to Life Organization to amend this in the Senate. But, basically, what the Bill does is makes a slight alteration in who can execute declaration of ... for a living will. And also, it changes term 'life sustaining' to 'death delaying'. The Illinois Right to Life Association is in favor of this change and has worked carefully with it. There's a minor change that will probably have to be undertaken in the But it's simply clean up language for an already Senate. good Acta And I move for a favorable Roll Calle"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran, moves for the passage of House Bill 1902. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed ... I'm sorry ... All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 \*present\*. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. Ωn this Order of Business appears House Bill 1995. Mr. Clerk. Out of the Record. On this Order appears the Bill. House Bill 1996. Out of the Record. On this Order appears House Bill 2114. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2114, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Hearing Aid Consumer Protection Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As amended, 2114 does 4 things. Number 1, it requires all Public Safety Agencies are required to install a TDD, which is a telecommunications device for the public safety answering points. at all Number 2. all Public Safety Agencies are required to install technologies at all public safety answering points which will incoming TDD calls. And Number 3, a Public Safety Agency is required to provide quarterly training on this equipment to their personnel. Number 4. the Illinois Commerce Commission shall, by January 1, 1991, conduct a survey of public service safety answering points and Public Safety Agencies to monitor compliance with this section. It ... the legislation was introduced at the request Chicago Hearing Society, in order to try and resolve some questions that lingered after we passed the Public Reform Act two years ago requiring the free distribution of to all deaf persons. This will make sure that the instruments that are issued are compatible with those public safety answering points. I move for its passage." Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves

the passage of House Bill 2114. And on that, the Gentleman

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield to a couple of quick questions?"

Bowman: "Yes, Sir."

Piel: "Woody, first of all when we are talking about Public

Agencies. Are we basically talking about strictly State

Agencies or are we talking about local, state and federal?"

Bowman: "We're talking about local agencies and actually the agencies that are most affected are the 911 agencies."

Piel: "Okay. What are we talking about as far as cost to the State of Illinois on this?"

Bowman: "A Fiscal Note has been filed. The cost is approximately \$80.000 to \$75.000 dollars."

Piel: "And is that including any personnel that we would have to hire for this?"

Bowman: "Let me examine the note more carefully. I will quote from the Fiscal Note. It says 'The cost includes salary, fringe benefits, statewide travel, purchase of TDO machine, training, telecommunication costs and clerical support persons. The first year cost will be approximately \$80,000 and each succeeding year, approximately \$75,000."

Piel: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock?"

Hallock: "He's talking to his mother again. Hill the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Hallock: "Representative Bowman, does this impact in any way on the mail order hearing aids which are all so important to the cost of hearing aids for senior citizens?"

Bowman: "Thank you for the question, Representative Hallock. The underlying Bill, the Bill as introduced, did affect mail order hearing aids. However, it was a vehicle Bill. I was asked by the Chicago Hearing Society to do this at the last

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

minute so I grabbed something off the shelf that the LRB had already drafted, introduced it. Amendment 01 guts that Bill, completely rewrites it. Amendment 01 is the Bill and in its present form it has nothing to do with mail order hearing alds."

Hallock: "Well I appreciate your saying that in your Amendment because I believe that mail order hearing aids really help keep the cost down for senior citizens who need hearing aids. It was wise for you to take that Amendment and I urge you to keep going with your good efforts in this regard. And I support the Bill."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this bill pass?' A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. And this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this are 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no'. This Bill having received a 'present'. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this order appears 2299. House Rill Out of the Record. And 2301. Mr. Clerk, read the 3ill. 2301.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2301, a bill for an Act to amend the
Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, on

House Bill 2301. Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2301 incorporates provisions Bills 1995-96. 2299, 2302 and 2479. in House The consolidation was made at the request of Judiciary the Committee which considered this Bill. And defines a physically handicapped person and increases the offense for aggravated assault, criminal sexual abuse. criminal sexual abuse against ... when committed against a

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

handicapped person, or a person over 60 years of age. I move its passage."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage has moved for the passage of House Bill 2301. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young?"

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Young: "How is a phsycially handicapped person defined in this Bill?"

McCracken: "It's defined in Section 2-15(a). It means that a person who suffers from a permanent and disabling physical characteristic resulting from disease, injury, functional disorder, or congenital condition."

Young: "And exactly what this Bill increases the penalties for crimes committed against physically handicapped persons?"

McCracken: "Yes, Sir."

Young: "Is there an intent portion to the increase in penalties or a knowing portion?"

McCracken: "Yes. There is a ... they are specific intent crimes.

The person has to act knowingly."

Young: "No. I'm not talking about the intent for the crime. I'm talking about there is ... I guess there is a stiffer penalty if this is done against a physically handicapped person than against a normal person. Is that correct?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Young: "Okay, is there provision in the Bill that says you have to know that the person was physically handicapped before the stiffer penalty applies?"

McCracken: "No."

Young: "What offenses are included in this Sill?"

McCracken: "Aggravated assault, robbery, criminal sexual abuse and aggravated criminal sexual abuse."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. McCracken, do you wish

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

to close?"

- McCracken: "Thank you. I think this is a necessary measure and I would appreciate the support of the Body."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Jill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. This is final action. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Barger. One minute to explain your vote."
- Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering ... You may shake your head in answer. Is there a reduced penalty for handicapped assailants?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'present'. This voting \*no\*\* 2 3ill. having received a Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared On page 23 of the Calendar, on the Order of House passed. Bills, Third Reading, Criminal Law appears House Bill Ms. Stern, 34? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 34, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Stern."
- "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Stern: Well intentioned little Bill has run afoul of the National Rifle Well, I want to tell you about it and I hope Association. you will keep your minds open. They are, as our former States Attorney used to say, diabolically opposed. let me tell you what it's about. This was a Bill requested by the National Association of County Officials Lake County Board, and what it does is prohibit the sale or Now the ... I plastic firearms. use of want to get finished before Mr. what's his name, gets the Floor. It is perfectly true, as the NRA says, that there is not now all plastic firearm that will go through the metal

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

detectors at the airports or at the Court Houses. However. as the National Rifle Association itself says. certainly a trend that has been underway for nearly half a century, and is encouraged by the increasing cost of and other raw materials, as well as the increasing cost associated with shaping those materials into This is a preventive measure. Ladies Gentlemen. We hope to have this legislation in place before those who are working on it perfect an all plastic firearm that can then go onto aircraft and into Court Houses and bring terrorism into everyones back yard. your support of this Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, As. Stern, moves for the passage of House Bill 34. And on that, the Gentleman from Jefferson. Ar. Hicks?"
- Hicks: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. I would ask at this time that I

  be joined by seven Members of the House in removing this

  Bill from the Order of Short Debate, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "No, it's on House Bills, Third Reading,
  Criminal Law. Proceed, Sir."
- Hicks: "Okay, fine, thank you. Plastic bullets. Sounds good to me. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would raise ... I would like to raise a few points about the plastic firearms, as it is called in the Bill, with all due respect to the Sponsor of the Bill. I think House Bill 34, in its current form and what it relates to with plastic guns, is something of a hysteria that's being created by the ... why thank you ... by the media itself. It's really a non-issue type of a situation, and I do respect the Lady's intention of trying to remove some of the problems we have throughout world dealing with terrorism and that type of thing. But actually it's not an issue at all. Plastic duns as you ••• as are being described in the Bill itself, have been

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

with us for many, many years. It's not something new. It's not something that has just been brought forward. not something been newly created. Even during the Vietnam era, we had plastic guns that we used on The M-16 Rifle, for example, is a plastic gun as described in this. But a plastic gun is not a plastic gun. It doesn't have a barrel that's made of plastic. It simply a stock that's made of plastic. There considerable amount of steel, or other types of metal, involved in the making of that weapon. And it's simply something that has been created by the media, and I would ask that all of you take a very close look at this because really it doesn't do anything to help legislation. any situation concerning terrorism in the world or anv of that type of thing. And I would ask you to take very serious consideration with the Bill before you vote. And I would ask you to vote 'no' on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Tate. The Chair would like to just remind the Body that there are hundreds of Bills on this Calendar. And while debate ought not to ever be stifled on any issue, perhaps we could use restraint. Mr. Tate."

Tate: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a stupid Bill. This Bill ... I mean it ... what we probably should have done is, we probably should have amended this Bill to protect ourselves from little men from outer space because ... I mean, where are we going with this? I mean, what we're talking about doing is, we \* re regulating a specific type of gun. The real issue here is technology. Let me tell you another Bill that we should introduce if this Bill ... if this Body approves this legislation. Recently an American manufacturer has come out with a new ammunition, a bullet that is a silent

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

bullet, because oftentimes their shooting ranges are located in communities and neighborhoods. So, as a result, have developed a new technology to produce a new bullet that doesn't make noise. That could be the silent What ... I mean, the Sponsor is well intended and I think she is sincere in her efforts, but I think the real issue here is not ... is not whether we should outlaw non-metal weapons or whether we should prohibit non-metal The real issue here is whether we are going to go weapons forward with technology. This is the only aun that currently is made that is non-metal. It is an Austrian That the stimulus of this legislation came from aun. Congressmen that allegedly walked through a metal detector done unseen. The Federal Government ... both the regulatory bodies of the Federal Government have rejected It has failed in Congress. The aureau legislation. in Washington has rejected this legislation. And that if we are going to arbitrarily start selecting what is and illegal then it becomes one more tvpe οf infringement upon our right to keep and bear arms. And I ask all the Membership to look very closely at this would legislation and to look at it from a perspective that progressive. This doesn't address, I think, the isn't problem that she is trying to accomplish. And I would ask all the Members to reject this legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the outcome is pretty predictable and therefore, I move to previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Ar. Flinn moves the previous question. All those in favor of the previous question being put signify as saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Lady from take, Ms. Stern, to close."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. T suspect Representative Flinn is right, the outcome is predictable. I do not pretend that this is Let me just say in closing. On the other pro-jun Billa hande I want VOIL TO understand that this was not intended to be an anti-qun Bill. I tried to talk to the Rifle Association I discussed it with 3 different Gentlemen who came to me about the Bill. I said. 'Tell me what you want it. Do you want it to say a Bill that won't go through a metal datector? I will change it. They chose not discuss it any further. They simply said that they didn't like the Bill. I don't think it is a stupid Bill want to tell you that neither do the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police think it is a stupid Bill. They think it Bill whose time has come. And I suggest to you that it is. It is a prudent Bill and it is not, I repeat, is not anti-gun legislation in the classic polarizing I hope you hunters and target marksmen home and the good sense of having this can see legislation in place when state of the art weaponry pass through even the best scrutinized metal detector. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. The Gentleman from Cole, Mr. Weaver, one minute to explain your vote."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill deals with something that does not exist.

There are no plastic weapons made today. The technology is not with us. If you want to vote to enforce legal requirements and regulations of squirt guns, fine. Vote green on this Bill. But, if you want to vote for a little

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

bit more freedom in dealing with the problem, when it exists, the old saying is don't fix it if it ain't broke. There is no plastic gun that won't ... that will make it through a metal detector. You need to vote 'no' on this Bill. This is a bad Sill."

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 38 voting "aye", 70 voting "no", 5 voting "present", and the Bill fails. On this Order appears House Bill 66.

  Mr. Clerk, read the 3ill. Out of the Record. On this Order appears House Bill.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Sill 176, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an Amendment 5 that I would like to move this Bill back to Second to be placed on for clarification."
- Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"
- Parke: "Could I have this Bill moved back to Second to put an Amendment to clarify •••"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for leave of the House to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave?

  Leave is granted. Hr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 35, offered by Representative Parke."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke, on Amendment #5."
- Parke: "We had to delete 'if bail bond is ordered by the Court' and ending 'any other financial obligations of the defendant'. That was to clarify the provision that was questioned with Ruling #4, out of order. This now makes it clear and I think it's in compliance with what my

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

colleagues in the law profession asked."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke, moves for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House dill 176. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke, asks leave of the House to waive Rule 37(b), so this matter may be heard in standard. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted using the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 176, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading

  of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Parke, on House Bill 176."
- Parke: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 176 provides that bail bond deposited by or on behalf of the defendant in one case, may be used in the court's discretion to satisfy it's financial obligations of costs, restitutions to a victim or a payment ordered for court appointed counsel. I ask for passage of this legislation."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke, moves for the passage of House Bill 176. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young."
- Young: "Will the Sponsor yield? Is there any provision in the Bill that would ... that provides for, if the bail bond money was put up by someone other than the defendant, that this would not apply?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Parke: "Not that I am aware of."

Young: "Well then, is it your intention then that, just for an example, the defendant may be a 19 or 20 year old whose bond money was put up by his parents. Then is it your intent by this Bill that that bond money should be used maybe to pay some of the defendant's obligations, rather than go back to his parents?"

Parke: "Alright, what I would like to think is that bond is somebody's benefit. And I don't know necessarily if I can always take in consideration who deposits the bond. If the person is found guilty in the courts discretion, they feel that this money should be used. And again, the court is going to make the discretion. I think they may take in consideration. it's not my intent through this legislation to take into consideration who is posting the bond. think I'll let the court make that decision. I think it's a good victims' rights Bill so that some restitution can be made to victims by using this bond money. think it's something that is needed by the citizens of Illinois."

Young: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for questions."

Countryman: "Now, Representative Parke, we had some problems with the Amendments. But, let me see if I recite the Bill as you understand it. As the Bill with the final Amendment on, the court has the discretion where to apply this bond money, including the attorney's fees. Is that correct?"

Parke: "That is correct."

Countryman: "Alright. Now this only applies, as I understand it,
to those cases in which there is no conviction resulting.
In essence the law controls in those cases where the
conviction occurs in that case. Is that right? This is

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- the case where either for one reason or another it was dismissed or not prosecuted or something.
- Parke: "Or plea bargained. Most of the time it would probably
- Countryman: "Well, a plea bargain may result in a conviction in one case and a dismissal of the other. And this is a Judge

  Steigmans proposal for the other cases. Is that right?
- Parke: "That is correct."
- Countryman: "Alright. And so now the Judge has the discretion at any time of the proceeding then to make the determination who will get that money. Is that correct?"
- Parke: "That's my understanding."
- Countryman: "Alright. So that if an attorney files what's called a bail bond assignment, he can enter an order before termination of the proceedings assigning the money to the attorney. Is that correct?"
- Parke: "I'm not sure that I know the answer to that question, quite frankly."
- Countryman: "Alright. In addition to that, he can also enter an order, if the public defender is appointed, assigning that money to the County to reimburse the County for the cost of the public defender."
- Parke: "We worked on this Bill, you and I. And if that was the
  ... those were the Amendments that we put in. I agreed to
  them if that was the intent of those Amendments, then I
  agreed to that."
- Countryman: "That was the intent of one of the Amendments which I attempted to place on the 3ill. But my understanding is, your now Amendment &5, I believe it is, changes it to give the judge full discretion, but I want to make sure that he still has the discretion to assign the money from the public defender or ... for the cost of the public defender."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Parke: "That is absolutely correct. That was the agreement I made."

Countryman: "Okay, thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This 3ill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this Order appears House Bill 192. Mr. read the Bill. Ar. Young, do you wish to proceed?
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 192, a bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young."
- Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 192 amends the Code of Criminal Procedure, and it limits the ability to subpoena an attorney to testify before a Grand Jury. And I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young, moves for the passage of House bill 192. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for questions."

- McCracken: "This creates no implication relative to the attorney/client privilege? I mean, it obviously has no bearing on that privilege?"
- Young: "Well in a manner of speaking it does, because what it does is, it would create a judicial review before the subpoena was issued so that a court could determine that the attorney/client relationship was not being breached or

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

abused in any way."

McCracken: "Okay, and the factors you list have to be found by the court in order to approve the subpoena?"

Young: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Okay. These are similar, are they not, to Department of Justice standards?"

Young: "I think they are the exact standards."

- McCracken: "And as a matter of fact, in at least... in the federal Grand Juries there was that type of abuse during Watergate among other times. So I think this is an important Bill and one that should be passed. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this Order appears House Bill 330. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 330, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, the Majority Leader."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill adds another paragraph to the Aggravated Battery Section of the Criminal Code. It will provide that a person who commits an aggravated battery by causing bodily harm to a person who is physically handicapped. Currently, that section of the Code refers to a number of different individuals and sets them ... and sets them apart for special consideration. For example, we do it for police officers, for firemen, for senior citizens over the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

age of 60, for judges as it would relate to the performance official duties. This adds another with the physically handicapped. It came up dealing because, in my hometown, a severely physically handicapped individual was attacked by someone. The State's Attorney felt that he was handicapped because he could only charge individual with a Class A Misdemeanor. have the option of charging him with an aggravated battery. I walked on the Floor when Ar. McCracken was explaining his Bill a few minutes ago, so I'm not sure how this differs from his. except in response to Mr. Young's question, we did add 'knowingly' to this statute. So I move for the passage of the Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Ar. McPike, moves for the passage of House Bill 330. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of this Bill. I think this protection is needed, because I think individuals who are handicapped are frequently targets of muggers and others who would prey on them because of their handicap. And I think they deserve this additional measure of protection. And I think Representative McPike has done a superb job in sponsoring this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Clerk has available now change of vote forms for the Consent Calendar which was

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

this morning. And ... so we will be ... we earlier read will be voting on these and then you will have a period of hours ... or an hour to register any changes of vote which would allow you to register 'no'. or \*present\*. tahcontt after you have done that. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will go to the Consent Calendar for Bills that require that must be brought back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Hr. Clerk. Order appears House 3ill 1636. And on that ... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, asks leave tο return Bill to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment. Leave is granted. Mr. Clark, are there Amendments to House Bill 1636?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Hartke, on Floor Amendment \$4."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Ar. Speaker, Kembers of the Amendment &4 would add \$25,000 to House Bill 1636. is is an appropriation for a probation program for Richland County. They're trying something very new. They\*re developing a Teen Court System in Richland County where juvenile offenders, rather than going through the normal court system, are being, shall we say, sentenced and judged by their peers, and it's a very successful program California and in Texas, and it i f mavaaa successful, this program could keep kids out of jail and and I think it's a very good, life of crime. worthwhile program and I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham moves for the adoption of Amendment &4 to House Bill 1636, and on that, is there any discussion? There... Yes, the Gentleman from DuPage, Ar. McCracken."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

McCracken: "This Bill's on the Consent Calendar, is it not?"

Speaker Greiman: "That's correct."

- McCracken: "Okay. Mr. Hartke, did you present this matter in the Appropriations Committee? Chuck?"
- Hartke: "No. I did not at that time, Tom, and the reason we didn't, there was hope that funding could be derived in a meeting at Peoria, and we were assured it would be, but then it did not come forth, so we're trying this method."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Only because I thought Tom had some problems and the Gentleman did come to me, the Sponsor of the Bill. It came to his attention after the Bill had been in Committee and we accept the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. That Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, I am advised that there is an Amendment 3 that was not called in error. So, further Amendments? With leave of the House we will go to Amendment 3."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 33, offered by Representative

  Leverenz."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 23 would restore a \$50,000 amount to their budget request that would continue the funding of the Committee for the Evaluation of Judicial Performance. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, moves for the adoption of Amendment &3 to House Bill 1636. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Mays is not

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

up here. What does this do again, Representative?"

Leverenz: "This would fund a current program that started in the year that we are in now, that Judge Sullivan is overseeing."

McCracken: "How much?"

Leverenz: "It's a \$50,000 amount for the Committee for Evaluation of Judicial Performance. It's in... this would make it in its second year."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "There again, Mr. Speaker, so that Representative McCracken is aware, we discussed this matter with Chief Justice Clark yesterday, and Judge Sullivan. This is a program to improve the administration of justice in so many ways. Even though it's in its first year, we have already seen the fruits of its improvement, and I appreciate your support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It sounds like we're dripping back into these probation things that we were cutting originally and just adding on and adding on, but I would like to ask the Sponsor if he would answer this question. If this goes statewide, what do you think the cost of it would be, once this board goes into statewide operation?"

Leverenz: "What board are you referring to? This is... "

Parcells: "The Judicial Performance Board."

Leverenz: "This is just an evaluation process that they're doing.

I think what you may be talking about would be covered in

Amendment #5. This is just an oversight of how the
judicial operation is running, and they recommend
improvements, and it could be statewide now."

Parcells: "Once the system gets set into place, do we have any

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

idea what this will cost?"

- Leverenz: "I don't know that there would be any statewide committee. This is just a sitting committee now, that evaluates judicial performance."
- Parcells: "Right, but I have a feeling that the Supreme Court, or I have some input that the Supreme Court would like to expand this statewide, and I think it could become quite a big ticket item, once they get their... the system into operation, but they have... you have no figures on that?"

Leverenz: "No, I do noto"

Parcells: "Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4 was adopted previously. Floor

  Amendment #5, offered by Representative Leverenz and Mays."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, on Amendment 85."
- "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Amendment #5 would reduce and restore the following things - these are changes from what we did in Committee. It would reduce \$500.000 from the request for Judges in the Circuit Court salaries. It would reduce further another \$500,000 for Judges in the Circuit Court known as "A's." It would reduce a million dollars from the request for Associates Judges\* pay. Further, would restore 93,800 in contractual services, restore 213,417 for training of probation personnel, for total appropriation of \$900,000 thera. Further, for probation pretrial services, which the General Assembly has mandated controlled bу the Supreme Court, would 6,068,981, which we took back to zero in Committee until we found out exactly how much would be up and operating for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the year that we're going into. The net increase of the budget then is for 4,376,198. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment and answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to waive Rule 37(b) so that this matter be considered in standard and for return of this to the Consent Calendar. Is there leave? Leave is granted using the Attendance Roll The Consent Calendar having previously been read. all those in favor with respect to House Bills. Third Reading, Appropriations Consent Calendar, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. me remind Members again, that Change of Vote Forms are available at the well. Have all voted who wish? ... Jack? Take the record. On page 26 of the Calendar, on the Order of Higher Education, House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 1587. Mr. Keane? Out of the Record. On that Order appears House Bill 1805. Mr. Clerk, read the 3111."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 1. We're on page 26 of the
  Calendar, Higher Education, Second Reading. Floor
  Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCracken."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. AcCracken, on Amendment 01."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- McCracken: "Hr. Speaker, I think we did this last night and I withdrew it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Okay, the Amendment is withdrawn. Further

  Amendments?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Okay, Amendment is withdrawn."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House 3ill 1805, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, on House
  Bill 1805."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1805 is a piece of legislation that I think each and every one of us would like to be identified with and if you haven't signed on as a Co-Sponsor, I believe you would want to pretty quickly. This legislation provides for 6 mini Math and Science Academies to be established throughout the State. The best part of the legislation, in my estimation, is the fact that I actually do not call for any new money from the State to be appropriated. The way we would handle this is that the Board of the State Department of Education and the \*\*\*
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of our Representatives filed a fiscal note request on this yesterday. And apparently it has not been satisfied. The Calendar reflects that a fiscal note has been requested."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. McCracken, the Chair recognized you on an Amendment that you withdrew. And frankly did... thought that all of the incumbrances were taken off of it. Were taken off of it, and that we could then move the 3ill to Third Reading. Certainly, we want to respect your ...

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the request of your Member. The Chair could rule that your observation is untimely. However, the Chair would ask Mr. Phelps, in the spirit of moving the Business of the House in an orderly fashion, to take this out of the record at this time, or return the Bill to Second Reading, so that you can either agree to obtain such a fiscal note or make an appropriate Motion. Mr. Phelps?"

- Phelps: "Thank you, Sir. I would agree to take it out of the Record."
- Speaker Greiman: "Let's move it back to Second Reading."
- Phelps: "If I might just indicate quickly. When this was on the Calendar Friday, I was prepared. I have not missed a vote, I have been here. The Amendment that he had then attached to it was not distributed and also printed. I took it out of the record then to accommodate him. Then he withdrew the Amendment. Now a Fiscal Note. I've asked for a Fiscal Note and it's not here. I really think I've bent over backwards to cooperate."
- Speaker Greiman: "Nice guys often finish last. Mr. McCracken?

  What is your pleasure, Sir?"
- McCracken: "It was filed yesterday by one of our Members. I feel

  I have to ask for it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, you were within your rights, as would be the Gentleman from Saline to move to make it inapplicable.

  The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, moves that a Fiscal Note requirement be held inapplicable to this 3ill and we are now on the Order of Second Reading. And on that Motion, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. It seems that the Fiscal Note requirement, we've
  gotten to the point where I think it's being abused and if
  merely by a Hotion and the votes on this House, we can
  overrule this kind of requirement. It doesn't seem to me

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

that it is being particularly, particularly effective. I think also, if the Gentleman has requested a Fiscal Note from the appropriate Agency and they haven't responded to his request, I think we as a Body ought to take them the task. Because without us, they are nothing. And it just seems inappropriate that we would be able to move to remove the requirement for the Fiscal Note. It's on that general principle, not on the Gentleman's 3ill specifically, that I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Kane, Ms. Deuchler."

- Duechler: "Hell, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the Fiscal Note. I filed the Fiscal Note. It was filed in a timely manner. I do feel that it's very important for us to know the Fiscal implications of these additional summer school programs and I really think that we need to have this information."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the fiscal Note be held inapplicable with respect to House Bill 1805?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the note is held inapplicable. Third Reading. Mr. Phelps. Kr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate (sic, House) Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, briefly, if you will look at the merits of the Bill, I think you will agree why the awkwardness of the fiscal note was handled. There is nothing to substantiate a dollar figure that would cost the state in new money. The reason for that, the Bill that sets up... establishes the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

six mini math/science academy, handles it in the wav in which the Board of Education and the trustees of the universities will iointly decide geographically locations throughout the state that would be disbursed on an even access to those throughout the state. T+ - - iust suggestion, we could be talking about Southern Illinois University, U of I, Eastern, Martin Luther Northwestern, wherever thev would select to be geographically balanced to access these children. the strong point to remember is that the money that we are talking about to fund the programs would be taken from the \$15,000,000 that we have already appropriated for the summer programs to the education reform. That means we are giving to local schools the option to select these aifted math and science children that would go to the universities and we would not have to be looking at residential building because the universities in the summertime have available housing on the universities in which Our tax money gone for. So, based on some tuition that could be paid by parents, some endowments that could be in the that we have provided for in the Bill and the 15.000.000 that is already in place for summer programs that schools yet to designate what those programs are for. have Now. I know some would say, it may not be for gifted, but i f serious about it. looking at math and science and the gifted program, then I think we should take аt our summer programs before they are established. can correct, maybe. some mistakes. before... W2 So. looking at the geographically balanced and how they would be set up in the universities, the summer programs and the money that is already in place, plus requiring that the tuition and endowments come in play, I believe you agree that this is a very practical way to address

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

something that we put so much emphasis on, math and science gifted students. I appreciate your support.  $^{\rm n}$ 

Speaker Greiman: "Ar. Clerk, would you read this Bill a third time again?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1805, a 3ill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill... correction, Second..."

Speaker Greiman: "And on that, the Lady from Kane, Ms. Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Would Representative yield for a question, please?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Deuchler: "What was the genesis of your idea for setting up additional math/science academies, Representative Phelps?

Did you feel that because of the math science academy already established that this idea was... merited extension or was it an effort to replace the math/science academy in existence with this type of program?"

Phelps: "Although I must admit the Aurora facility is quite costly and I regret that we did not take a look at something like this on a more practical approach earlier, maybe going into something similar to the residential in Aurora. However, my plan is only to try to make accessible to those students who are young age who cannot or will not really consider going to Aurora and staying full time as a residential place. But summertime is a time that these children and students can utilize their time and programs that are accessible to the university, very close to them. That's the genesis."

Deuchler: "Did a particular group bring this idea to you?"

Phelps: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Deuchler: "Did a group suggest this idea to you?"

Phelps: "Did a group?"

Deuchler: "Yes, some statewide group or college suggest this to you?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Phelps: "A combination of that, yes, statewide group and individuals and students that are not accessible in my area to travel to Aurora and do not have the..."
- Deuchler: "Can you tell us what group suggested this?"
- Phelps: "Well, one particular group I know has endorsed it is the Illinois Education Association."
- Deuchler: "I notice on page 1, down around line 24 and 25, there is language in the legislation saying that both high school and college levels of instruction will be provided.

  Doesn't that imply some kind of state support or state funding?"
- Phelps: "I didn't hear all of your statement, but I believe..."
- Deuchler: "Well, I'm just... just getting back to the funding question, Representative."
- Phelps: "Okay. The funding, I explained to you, Representative

  Deuchler, was in the three parts in the plan was through

  endowments, tuition and the summer program money that we
  have already appropriated for education reform."
- Deuchler: "Well, Representative Phelps. to the Bill. Ιt certainly seems just at the time that we are complete the first year at the math/science academy and establish the second year's funding that it seems as though your plan is, perhaps, premature. Sometime in the future. the functions are not covered by the i f some οf math/science academy, that some of your ideas may be instituted, but right at this time with the tight State funding that we have and with the uncertain future, I would certainly be opposed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw. Welcome back, Ms. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker. Thank you all very much.

  Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we
  instituted one of the most outstanding education reform

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

in this nation in the spring of 1985. packages At that time, we knew that we had put together a package of initiatives for improving our schools throughout this state that we must be attentive to seeing to it that those initiatives were properly funded, were fulfilled. followed through on. One of those initiatives was the residential mathematics and science academy that is located in Aurora and it was the intent of those of us who Senate Bill 730 that that academy would be the flauship. would set, in fact, the pace for really sophisticated instruction in mathematics and science for all school districts and all school children throughout this State. That academy has only been in operation for one year. is, in fact, in need of some funding so that it can take in additional students for the forthcoming school Although I certainly endorse the concept of this Bill, it decidedly premature. ₩hat dollars is verv available from the State for use for education ought now to be. in fact, concentrated on fulfilling the initiatives of the education reform package, one of which is residential academy. When the academy has put in place and developed what I know will be probably the most outstanding curriculum for gifted education in mathematics science in the world, perhaps, then in fact that curriculum ought to be extended. In fact, we would obliged to extend that to all school children throughout this State who indicate a degree of giftedness subjects, but in the meantime... Mr. Speaker, I regard this tinkering with the education reform package. It is premature and I would suggest that for that and a number of other reasons many of which are fiscal, that this Bill is, in fact, one we ought to defeat, with due respect to the Sponsor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Young: "Does the Bill identify where the six locations for these summer schools will be?"

Phelps: "Representative Young, they are not yet identified in the Bill because we have created a governing board that would be selected from the colleges and universities and also the State Board of Education that would decide where the locations would be."

Young: "Would this program be an overnight program where the students would stay four or five days a week?"

Phelps: "In the Bill, we provided an option of either it could be a commuter type program or a residential, knowing that the summer... the time the universities do have available dormitories and housing. So, it could be handled either way. We give that to the local governing board to control."

Young: "Okay. To the Bill. I'm not a supporter of the math academv• but the reason this Bill disturbs me is because it would take summer school funding for these six special summer academies where presently we have a great difficulty getting funding for regular summer deal of schools and the schools existing within some of the cities of the State right now and I'm afraid that this would take funding away from the current summer school program and give it to these six special schools. And therefore, have to rise in opposition to this legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison. Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison moves the previous question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, to close."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quickly, the fiscal note was just handed to me when we got in debate and I would bring it to your attention. The only cost that we are talking according to the fiscal note by the State Board of Education. is the governing board and the executive director that we spoke to you about. The board expenses would be per diem travel and meeting expenses would \$10,000. The executive director expenses would be based on \$45,000 annual salary, which would be about \$26,000, and I think there is a total then cost of \$36.000 according to the State Board of Education. Now, I think this is a fair price to pay, when we are talking about and to address Representative Cowlishaw's remarks on competing with the residential Aurora Math and Science Academy. summer program only that addresses in this Bill. I believe that we could successfully recruit the top-notch math and science students that right now cannot go to Aurora because of various conditions and yet they could be recruited successful summer program that ultimately might end in the residential facility in Aurora. So, I don't see should look at competition and be scared to look on new things and improving. Who said the education reform was perfect? And if you call it tinkering, then I hope we can improve it and I would admit to trying to do that. that's the case. I appreciate your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Yes, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Hr.

  Turner, one minute to explain your vote."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, I rise in support of this legislation. I know that there has

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

been a lot of discussion about magnet schools in the local area. I have been a strong supporter of the math/science academy, but I also feel that the opportunities for kids to participate in a program of this nature during the summer would be beneficial to the overall educational environment in terms of those kids who are unable to attend the academy. There are a lot of parents who... there are some parents who have some fear about sending their kids away at 14 and the kid not being able to come back until after high school, and at that point, he would probably go on off to college somewhere. So I think that in one of eludes the family structure there. I think that important that we allow the kids to get some participation in terms of our improving the math and science skills and I think that the setting up o f additional centers for the summer months would certainly help the overall public school system in the City Chicago and I urge the Members to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Ar. Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Hembers of the House. I know that the Sponsor of this Bill is well—intended and had we not made a decision a couple of years ago relative to the one math/science school, I think this Bill might have been given merit at that time. But since we have made that decision already, it seems too premature to, at this point, appear to water down that math/science flag program that we have. And I would urge people not to support this at this point in time and wait until we see how the academy continues to work out in the next couple of years."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from LaSalle, Ms. Breslin, one minute to explain your vote."
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I, too,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

rise in support of this legislation. I have students from my district who attend the math/science academy in the northern part of the state and they benefit from it. have some downfalls. This does system makes the gifted education available to all of our availability of students and I believe at a far, far lower cost is... and with far less difficulty than what has been experienced at the math/science academy in the northern part of the state."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, one minute to explain your vote."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. I had so many students in my district and south and west of my district that tried to get in the academy, but according to the rules that they set, they were only going to take so many from so many places. I think we need more of these schools throughout the state and I think it's a very good program and we should put more schools throughout the state for this. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland, one minute to explain your vote."
- Kirkland: "Yes, I have problems with this Bill simply because I think we are having enough trouble getting the math and science academy adequately funded. It's located... it's location is logical in terms of being in the high tech corridor and so forth. That's why it's there. I think we should concentrate on making it one of the finest academies in the world and I think we are going to dilute that possibility with this Bill. So, urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, asks for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. The Gentleman from Saline asks for a poll of those not voting. Excuse me. Mr. McCracken, Representatives Shaw and Sutker ask leave to be verified. Leave is... and Mr. Capparelli. Leave is granted for those three. Mr. Clerk, proceed."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Didrickson and Krska are not voting."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios. Black. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Augielski. Capparelli. Christensen. Curran. Daley. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Giglio. Dunna Farley. Flinn. Giorgi. Granbero. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Hultgren."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Ar. Clerk. Mr. DeLeo asks leave to be verified. You have leave, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative. Jones. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahev. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Rice. Richmond. Shaw. Sutkera Terzich. Turner. Steczo. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Wolf. Hyvetter Younge. And Ar. Speaker.™
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, questions of the Affirmative Roll Call."
- McCracken: "Yes, Sir, thank you. Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Granberg. How is Mr. Granberg recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Granberg from the roll call.

  Further questions?"
- McCracken: "Representative Williams."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Williams is at the door on the Democratic side of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Saltsman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Saltsman is in front of his desk."

McCracken: "Mr. Martinez."

Speaker Greiman: " Mr. Martinez is at his chair. Mr. Steczo asks
leave to be verified. Mr. Steczo, you have leave. Mr.
Hicks asks leave to be verified. He has leave. Yes, Ms.
Davis asks leave to be verified also. Ms. Davis. Yes,

McCracken: "Did you rule on Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Martinez is at his desk."

McCracken: "Oh, alright. Representative Hartke."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hartke is at his new desk."

McCracken: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi. How is Mr. Giorgi recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, then remove Mr. Giorgi from the roll call at this time, this particular time."

McCracken: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Younge. Is Ms. Younge in the chamber? Ms.

Younge is over at the door."

McCracken: "Representative Jones."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Jones had leave to be verified."

McCracken: "No, no, no, no, no, Speaker. That was Representative

Speaker Greiman: "You are correct. You are correct. Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones in the chamber? Is Ms. Jones in the chamber?

How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, remove the Lady from the roll call."

McCracken: "Representative Rea."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Rea is over on the... in the far aisle."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Laurino is in his chair. Ms. Satterthwaite asks leave to be verified. You have leave, Ma'am. And Mr. Dunn asks leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Representative Mulcaheyo"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey. Mr. Mulcahey. Is Mr. Mulcahey in the chamber? Mr. Mulcahey. How is Mr. Mulcahey?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry, is Ar. Mulcahey... no, alright. How
is Ar. Mulcahey... Ar. Aulcahey is right here. Alright.
Ar. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Leverenz 'aye'. Ms. Currie, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Record Ms. Currie as 'aye'. Record Ms. Stern as 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan in the chamber? How is Mr. Ronan recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting, 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Ronan. Ms. Jones has returned to the Chamber. Restore Ms. Jones to the roll call."

McCracken: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane. Mr. Keane. Is Mr. Keane in the chamber? How is Mr. Keane recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, remove Mr. Keane."

McCracken: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley. Is Mr. Farley in the chamber? Mr. Farley."

McCracken: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner is at his seat."

McCracken: "I think Mr. Farley was verified off. Does the record

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

reflect that?"

- Speaker Greiman: "No, you propounded another name before I was able to rule on that so I responded to your request."
- McCracken: "Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Farley,"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley in the chambers? Mr. Farley. How is Mr. Farley recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Farley. Restore Mr. Giorgi to the roll call. Mr. Wolf. Mr. Wolf. Leave to be verified?"
- Wolf: "Right."
- Speaker Greiman: "Aro Holf asks leave to be verified. Aso Barnes, were you seeking recognition? Ms. Barnes? No. Excuse me, Aro Matijevich, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"
- Matijevich: "Well, it's a violation while we are on a roll call,
  but I think we ought to wish a happy anniversary, 13th
  anniversary to Peg Breslin right here."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Matijevich, you who know the rules so I am certainly surprised that you would take this opportunity to proceed in that fashion. Ωn this ves. Mr. Bowman, for what purpose... guestion... Mr. Morrow, for what purpose do you seek... Mr. Granberg has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Granberg to the chamber. Now, I'm confused. I was going to declare the vote and now apparently you don't want me to declare the vote. Mr... Hultgren, for what purpose do recognition?"
- Hultgren: "To change my vote, Mr. Speaker, from 'yes' to 'no',
  please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Hultgren as "no". Mr. Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Yes, Ar. Speaker. Change my vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

  Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Hultgren as 'no'. Mr. Morrow, for

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- what purpose do you seek recognition? I meant Black. Yes, Black. Black to 'no'."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hould you change my vote from 
  'present' to 'yes'?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Record Ar. Morrow as 'yes'. Ar. LeFlore votes

  'yes'. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 51

  voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having
  received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
  passed. On this Order of Business... Ar. Panayotovich,
  what can I do for you?"
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce a former colleague of ours who is a good Republican from our district. He's standing on the Republican side, by mistake. The Honorable Augie 'Ruff', who was here in 1959 1961. Representative 'Ruff'."
- Speaker Greiman: "On page 14... yes, Mr. Regan, for what purpose do we seek... do you seek recognition?"
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a rather strange point Regan: I \* d like to announce for the personal privilege. information of the floor that we have a little crime going on. They seem to pick Representatives cars to take a slim jim and burglarize the cars. It happened to my last night, parked in front of the Sangamo Club. Ιt happened to Kay Hojcik's car Monday night and again So, I would advise all the Members of the House to night. please remove their valuables from the car and we reported it to the police and hope that they will be able to come around and protect us a little bit better. they are doing it in front of the Sangamo... there's a Democrat that got it too, so they are not just picking on Republicans. Take your valuables out of the car. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Preston, for what purpose do you seek

- 50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987 recognition?
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Regan, you might consider driving an automobile, as Representative Greiman does, you could be sure no self-respecting thief would break into that automobile."
- Speaker Greiman: "On page 14 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senior Citizens and Disabled, House Bills Second Reading, appears House Bill 664. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House 3ill 664, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. It's been read a second time previously. Amendment Ol was withdrawn on May 19th. Next Amendment is Floor Amendment Ol, being offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner, on Amendment #2."
- Turner: "Thank vou. Hr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Amendment #2 creates a task force, a force to be appointed by the Governor to study this tack issue of ... shared housing for senior citizens. It's concept that the Department of Aging is very interested in. Because of the homelessness and the lonely problem that a lot of senior citizens are confronted with. we decided to make this Amendment which would allow the Department tο determine the actual cost and the implementation of the types of senior shared program that be available. There are two or three states that currently have a senior shared housing program, the cost of that program running anywhere from 300,000 to a million We are asking this task force to study it. dollars. move for the adoption of Amendment 32 to House Bill
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 2

  to House Bill 664, and on that is there any discussion?

  The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

50th Legislative Dav

May 20, 1987

McCracken: "Thank you. The four legislative leaders name four Members, is that right?"

Turner: "That's correct."

McCracken: "And two persons appointed by the Governor from a list submitted by senior citizens organizations?"

Turner: "That's correct."

McCracken: "One by the Governor."

Turner: "Right."

McCracken: "One by the Department of Aging."

Turner: "That's right."

McCracken: "One from area agencies, also to be appointed by the Department."

Turner: "That's right."

McCracken: "And the Department of Agency (sic, Aging) shall provide research and development for the task force. Do you have any idea how much this would cost, this task force or study program?"

Turner: "We approximate the cost to be about \$75,000. The researcher would be from the task... from the Social Service Division of the Department of Aging."

McCracken: "And this Amendment changes the Bill from one which would initiate the program to one which will study the program, is that it?"

Turner: "That's correct. We're aware of the fact that the limited funds this year... not knowing what the budget is going to look like, the Department felt also that this would allow them time to say exactly what the cost of the shared program would be."

McCracken: "Okay, are they to report back to us? Is that... is that required in the Amendment?"

Turner: "Yes, we have asked that they report no later than July
1st of 1988. I'm talking with the Department people to ask
that they do it prior to that. I'd like to see about

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

putting this program off the ground next spring."

McCracken: "And the Department supports this?"

Turner: "The Department does support it."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner, asks leave to waive Rule 37(b) so this matter may be heard... is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 664, a dill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Yes, I think I explained the Bill earlier. The in fact, is the Bill. What it does, again, is it creates a senior shared housing task force to study the issue of senior shared housing here in the State of It's an issue that would certainly help the Illinois. senior citizen's community. It has been adopted in a couple of other states. We ask that a task created of nine Members to study this particular issue and to report back to the General Assembly by July 1 of next a favorable Roll Call on this vote on I move for House Bill 664."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House."

Bill 664, and on that, is there any discussion? The Lady

from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Like to ask the Sponsor a question or two, please."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Speaker Graiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Pullen: "How is this task force appointed?"

Turner: "Thank you. The task force, again, consists of nine Members..."

Pullen: "Appointed by whom?"

- appointments are by Turner: "The appointments... the Four persons with backgrounds and experience Governor. public or private housing sector, one each from the Minority Leader and the Majority Leader in the House, the President and Minority Leader in the Senate, two people from a list of four names submitted to the Governor senior citizen's organizations, one person appointed by the Governor, one person from the Department of Aging appointed by the Director of the Department and one person from the area agency appointed by the Director of the Department. The coordination of this..."
- Pullen: "I'm sorry. That sounds like more than nine people. Are
  there appointees by each of the legislative leaders and
  appointees by the Governor?"
- Turner: "There is four appointees, one by each of the legislative Leaders, two from the list that would be provided to the Governor. That's six. One more by the Governor. That's seven and one from the Department of Aging, appointed by that Director, which is eight and one from the area agency on aging, which is appointed by the Director of the Department, which is nine."
- Pullen: "Are you aware of whether there are any constitutional problems with the concept of appointments by both the Legislature and the Governor?"
- Turner: "I'm not aware of any constitutional problems. If, in fact, there are, I'm certain that we can correct it in the Senate but I'm unaware of any constitutional problems with that. This is a task force and not a commission."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Pullen: "If I may, I would urge you to research a Supreme Court decision, Illinois Supreme Court decision that I think related to the original creation of the original State Board of Elections, if my memory serves me correctly and it might be pertinent to this. Thank you."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative. We will check that. As I say, I'm willing to correct this in the Senate. This is by recommendation from the Department of Aging and it was with their knowledge and input that we came up with the nine member task force, but I'm certain that if there is something constitutionally wrong with this Bill that we can... we will correct it over in the Senate."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Kane, Ms. Doederlein."

Doederlein: "I think this is a good idea, but I was just wondering if the Council on Aging could take this project on because they are always looking for projects to help the Department of Aging and then there wouldn't be any cost, it wouldn't be another conference or a council. So, I would suggest that maybe the Council on Aging take on this project."

Turner: "The recommendation of the task force, again, came from the Department. If the Department feels that the Council on Aging can work on this issue, I would certainly be amenable to try to correct that in the Senate. The... My intent here is to try to implement a senior shared housing program and I think that whatever senior citizen organization, be it the Council or the Department, that is willing to study this particular aspect and come up with a cost figure that is reasonable to the State of Illinois, I am amenable to working with that group. And again, I will talk with the Department again and I can correct this over in the Senate and when it comes back here to the House, I

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

am sure that we should be able to reach concurrence."

- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is. 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Thic ic final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ar. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 112 voting \*ave\*, 2 "no". 1 voting 'present'. This 3i11. received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared On page 15 of the Calendar, on the Order of House nassed. Bills Second Reading - Consumer Protection, appears House Bill 2. Mr. Clark. Out of the record. On this Order of Business appears House Bill 1312. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1312, a Bill for an Act to amend the General Not-For-Profit Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Floor Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &2 is being offered by Representative Slater."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from AcDonough, Ar. Slater, on
  Amendment #2. Amendment #2 withdrawn. Further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment 33, offered by Representative Slater."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Slater, Gentleman from McDonough."

Slater: "Withdraw."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
Slater."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McDonough, Mr. Slater."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Slater: "Ar. Speaker, withdraw Amendments 4, 5..."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #... Amendments #4 and 5 are withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Slater: "6 and 7, withdraw."

Speaker Greiman: "And 6 and 7 are withdrawn."

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Has this Bill been previously read, Mr. Clerk?... Reading... Now we're turning to Higher Education - House Bills Second Reading, on page 26 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1587. 1587. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 26 of the Calendar, House 3ill 1587, a Bill
for an Act to amend an Act to provide tuition waivers for
children of employees of state supported colleges and
universities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. And now on page 26, on the Order of House Bills Third Reading — Coal Development, appears House Bill 1954. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1954, a Bill for an Act to designate a day to be observed as Coal Miners' Memorial Day. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, on House Bill 1954."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1954 is actually a commemorative memorial day for the coal miners of this state. He have, through history of coal mining of this state, have lost many loved ones in mine disasters, although I'm glad to report that the disasters that I reported in the last few years are to a minimal, but we do think there needs to be a

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

designated day to commemorate those who have lost their lives and perished in the coal mine. It's a high risk career and I think the families and the natives of Illinois would appreciate having a day. He have chosen November the 13th because the greatest mine disaster in Illinois history occurred at that time, back in 1905, the Cherry Street Mine... the Cherry Mine disaster and where 250 people perished. I believe. We appreciate your support.

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1954, and on that, the Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Hould... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, he'll yield for questions. Proceed."

Cowlishaw: "As the Sponsor of this Bill, could you please tell us whether you expect that on Coal Miners." Memorial Day the children in the schools of this state will be in school or they will be out?"

Phelps: "They will be in school."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none. the is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify question by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hr. take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby passed. On this Order appears House Bill 2797. declared Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act to create the
Underground Resources Conservation Enforcement Fund. Third
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Goforth."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Goforth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is actually a vehicle Bill. I would appreciate your support to send it out. We will have an Amendment on it in the Senate. It's an agreed Bill from all concerned. They are all... in the Department of Mines and Minerals. I ask for your support."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Goforth, moves for the passage of House 3ill 2797, and on that, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Matijevich: "Wayne, you have been here awhile, but is this your first Bill?"

Goforth: "Looks like it might be that way."

Matijevich: "Hey, here we go. Hayne Goforth's first 3ill."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Thic Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading... House Bills Second Reading — Labor, on page 32 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1006. Ar. Clerk, Bill. Out of the record. On this Order appears House the Bill 1035. Mr. Saltsman, do you wish to proceed on that Bill? Out of the record. On this Order appears House Bill Ar. Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." 1779.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1779, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills

Third Reading - Labor, on page 32 of the Calendar, appears

House Bill 423. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 423, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House • House 3ill 423 was a 5ill which was advocated by the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. What it does is place the fire fighters and the police in Illinois who serve under the Civil Service Commission with regards to disciplinary actions under the same provisions of those police and fire who serve under police and fire service The ... under the Civil Service Commissions a hoards. police officer or fire fighter, for example, could be disciplined for up to 30 days by a supervisor... a person directly above them in supervision and they feel it should be the same, and I agree with them, the same as under the police and fire boards whereby the police chief can discipline up to five days. After five days, it becomes a serious matter and should follow the Verv strict disciplinary procedures. I would appreciate your support. I think this is a reasonable Bill and should be a statewide standard."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Natijevich, moves for the passage of House Bill 423, and on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this Order of Reading appears House Bill 461. Are Clerk, read the Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "House Bill 451, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran,"
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply brings us into compliance with federal regulations. It deletes language which terminates contractual relationship between teachers and the school board as of a teacher's 70th birthday. I just move for the adoption... for the... move the passage of 461."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon moves for the passage of House Bill 461, and on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?\* favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed vote Voting is open and this is final action. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 1 there are votina This Bill, having received the Constitutional \*present\*. Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading - Labor, appears House Bill 678. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 678, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning comparable worth. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, on House Bill 678."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House

  Bill 678 is a fiscally responsible effort to solve the

  problem of sex discrimination in wage rates for employees

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

of the State of Illinois and of those in this state's university system. The problem of sex based wage discrimination is a problem that's been recognized in this country for at least the last two decades. According the National Academy of Sciences, women's work is not paid wages adequate to the value of that work to the emplover because in this society work done by minorities and work done by women is not valued very highly. Homen's work not worth very much. Because many jobs in this society and in this state are dominated by one gender or another, the problem of pay equity is a real one. I f you know what gender is likely to be the gender of particular wage category, it's easy for sex discrimination t o creen into the wage rates themselves. The problem of pay equity is one that many states have begun to resolve. fact, fully 40 of our sister states have already begun the kind of evaluation programs and study programs will enable them to see to it that wage rates for all their employees are fair and do not include any discriminatory bases. Fourteen states have already begun implementing wage scales that are fair for minorities and for women. In fact, our neighbor state, Minnesota, has already fully implemented pay scales for all of its employees that do not discriminate on the basis of race or sex. Similarly, the State of Iowa, the State of New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, all of these are moving rapidly down the course for a wage system that is fair and is equitable. The provisions House Bill 678 are fiscally responsible. The Bill provides that both the Department of Central Management Services and merit boards will adopt plans to the state universities' implement pay equity in one vear's time. The implementation of fair wage rates can be extended over a ten year period so as to make sure that our budget does not

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

go out of whack. I would be happy to answer your questions about the provisions of House Bill 673 and I would urge your support for its provisions."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved for the passage of

  House 3ill 678, and on that, the Lady from Cook, As...

  Didrickson."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will."
- Didrickson: "Barbara, you mentioned the fact that neighboring states have already implemented comparable worth. What about Minnesota? My understanding is that they phased it in, that it was really about a \$3100 pay raise per job category phased in over about four years and that what it really did was it put a lid on the higher paying male dominated jobs in order to bring up the lower paying female or women's work jobs."
- Currie: "That is not my understanding, Representative Didrickson.

  Minnesota did fully implement pay equity over, I believe, a
  three year period and my understanding is that there was
  neither diminution nor a cap placed on wage rates for
  nonfemale dominated job classes in order to make that
  experience work. In Minnesota, there is no labor strike.
  There are no lawsuits filed. As I understand it, the
  experience in Minnesota is one that shows that pay equity
  done in a sensible, sound and responsible manner can work
  well for the taxpayers, as well as for present victims of
  sex and race discrimination."
- Didrickson: "Well, I would just like to comment on the fact that
  we have done a little research on this and we have had
  contacts... Central Management Service has had contact with
  the State of Minnesota. This pay raise that we instituted
  really was at the expense, as I understand it from

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Minnesota, at the higher level paying male dominated job If that is true, then I would like to refer back to the Status of Homen Commission study that prompted comparable worth in the State of Illinois whereby we found that when we start applying these rankings that by the study the 100 percent female dominated Secretary II job category received 288 points. It received more points than the 100 percent male dominated electrician job category of 276 points. Now. here we've got the Secretary II who's making \$1486 dollars a month, but we've got an electrician making \$2826 at the prevailing wage rate. who is that mean then that the Secretary II. because she got more points than the electrician, is going to have her salary doubled, more than the electrician? Is that your intent with comparable worth?"

- Currie: "I would remind... I would remind you, Representative, that that was a preliminary pilot study paid for by the Assembly, approved by the Governor. General In order for pay equity to be implemented across the state personnel the Department of Central Management Services. under the provisions of House Bill 678, would be required t o flash out a plan for implementation. Ιt is my understanding that that plan would require them to go back look at all female dominated job classes and make and certain decisions about the value of the work performed to the employer. So, I don't believe..."
- Didrickson: "Okay, well, let's talk about another job category, if there is some fault there."
- Currie: "Well, let me just finish. I don't believe..."
- Didrickson: "What about the Clerk-typist II, who is 95 percent female dominated? Her wage there is \$983 a month. Let's go to the stationary engineer. 100 percent male dominated. He's making \$2389 a month. Her points are 170. His are

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- 157. What happens there under your Bill?"
- Currie: "What happens under this 3ill is that the Department of Central Management Services and the university's merit board evaluate all of the jobs, not just the few jobs that were the subject of the pilot study that you presently refer to. I don't think that we can take the results of that study and extrapolate them across all job classes or even assume that the answers in that 1983 study will be the answers discovered by the Department of Central Management Services and the Merit Board under the provisions of House Bill 678."
- Didrickson: "Well, what happens right now, under your Bill, then, if the Director of Central Management Services or the Merit Board and the university system determines just what I just said here in those two job categories, then what do you do?"
- Currie: "Under my Bill, the Department of Central Management
  Services and the University Merit Board would have to
  create a plan to implement fair wage scales for minorities
  and for women by 1997."
- Didrickson: "Well, is it your intent to have the unions or the state bargain these relative rankings? Does the Director of Central Management Services, does the Merit Board determine these rankings or does the collective bargaining unit determine these rankings under your Bill?"
- Currie: "Collective bargaining under the provisions of House Bill 678 will help to establish the way in which the implementation happens. There is a ten year time period during which that collective bargaining process and the proposals of the Department of Central Management Services can be part of that negotiating process."
- Didrickson: "Hho is actually going to come in and take these 1500 job categories and apply those rankings to?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Currie: "The Department of Central Management Services will do
  the evaluation of the present job classification system and
  the wage rates thereto attached. They will look at the
  complexity of the jobs themselves; that is the degree of
  effort, energy, skill and responsibility that go into the
  performance of those actual job categories and then they
  will make a determination whether the wage rates are
  responsive to the complexity of those jobs."
- Didrickson: "So they will make those determinations, not the bargaining unit, in studying salary, in studying points."
- Currie: "The study will be done by the Department of Central Management Services. The adjustments that may take place over the following nine years will be part of the collective bargaining process."
- Didrickson: "Okay, so you have answered my question and that the concern I would like to raise to those who purport to think that this is; (a) a good woman's issue or, (b) collective bargaining units are still going to be bargaining these points, putting these rankings allowing them to have the flexibility with regards to wages because it's taken out of their hands under House Bill 678. going to be assigning these rankings and studying Who is these wages then is going to be the Director of Central Management Services in conjunction with Hay Associates or Willis or whoever they bring in and they are arbitrarily be studying these rankings without any type of a aoina to standard. The standard was rejected last week. I say to you really want to do something for women in i f vou that the State of Illinois, you would have passed that Amendment last week whereby you would have moved women out of women's work and moved them into the male dominated job categories. It's always befuddled me why we think this is a good woman's issue. Why do we think that we want to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

leave those 100 percent male dominated job categories - for example, a financial examiner III or an accountant V - why aren't we moving women into this type of work. tell me that women aren't educated today and aren't able to This is a phony issue. It's not workable. Since 1946. Senators Morse and Claude Pepper tried to institute comparable worth and every year since, never define it. They could never nail it down. They couldn't put a standard to comparable worth. So did - or they did, at the national level, in 1963, was they instituted equal work for equal... equal pay for equal work and then they said, 'You can't have discrimination based on sex or race. That stands today. Comparable worth isn't going to change that one bit. This is a phony issue. believe in women's work. I would ask that you support it... you are going to set in to state law a mechanism that is going to trickle out into the private sector. I'm not certain how this affects prevailing I got a pretty good idea. You're not going to be able to live with this out there with regards to prevailing wage That's going to cause you a lot of problems and collective bargaining units aren't vour going to he whose points are deciding getting what iob and what classifications are going to get what salary range. Look at this. I really ask you to do that and I ask for a vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, please. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
wasn't going to rise until I heard the last speaker because
I did speak to this issue on Second Reading, but I want to
repeat what I said on Second Reading because, as I said on
Second Reading, I was a Sponsor of the Equal Rights

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Amendment and virtually all of the opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment said that if it were a matter or equal pay for equal work, they would be supportive of trying to bring pav equity into the job market. equity. They also said that their opposition to a Constitutional Amendment was that we ought to be doing this by statute. That's what we are doing now in the governmental sector. I don't think we ought to say categorically that this can't work because the Sponsor is being reasonable in giving a time frame so It has progressed in other states like it can work. Minnesota and I don't think that we in Illinois should shy away from it. I also said on Second Reading that I had been Chairman of the Appropriations Committee about ten ago and every time that we had a Director to appear affirmative action. before us and we raised the issue of they really gave lip service to it. So, I think that we ought to apply more than lip service when the evidence overwhelming that women... for every dollar paid by men. women are paid about 59 cents for equal type think it's a matter of discrimination that Legislature, should be involved with, as a matter of public policy. So, I would urge the Members on both sides of aisle to work towards this. It is something I think that all of us should be in favor of."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing." Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, rise reluctantly to oppose this Bill. that the discussion of comparable worth bу this Body verv legitimate. I think it is a legitimate issue to be discussed in all of our state, in the halls of this General Assembly, in the Committee room, but I think that there been some very good points made and I'd like to

reiterate the point that this is being made

into

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

issue. I think that is a mistake. I think that this state and the nation itself has moved a great deal of distance towards pay equity and yet, we want to now come in with legislation that would force some other inequities on our Things are moving. That's why I think discussion of this issue is good, but I sat in on some of the hearings that were held in the Committee and Ladies and Gentlemen. I think that those were pretty much a staged dog They weren't listening to the and pony show. opponents. the proponents. The Sponsor of this Bill was the Chairman of the Committee. That all worked in very nicely, but there are some downsides to passing this. There are some downsides to putting this in the statute and a lot of it has to do with jobs for your constituents and constituents. Now, if we want to eliminate iobs in Illinois and if we want to send a signal from this state that we are going to eliminate jobs, then we want to put this in the law. I think we need to continue equity. I think we need to move forward on it as fast as possible, but this is not the right wav. Иe shouldn't do this today. We shouldn't send those signals. ₩e should vote this Bill down."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hould the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will yield for guestions."

Ropp: "Madam Currie, let me ask a question relative to the procedure in the Bill as it pertains to determining the value of one position in comparison to another. How is that really determined in your proposal?"

Currie: "The Department of Central Management Services will adopt
a plan. They will, in effect, be responsible for
evaluating present job classification, status,
responsibilities and wage rates. Once that plan is

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

adopted, then adjustments in wage rates, if any are necessary, will be a function of the collective bargaining process. The Department will have until 1997 fully to implement the plan that it proposes.

- Ropp: "Well, is it your understanding that in this plan that there is no attempt to reduce some potential positions in terms of salary, based on whatever decision that plan might be?"
- Currie: "Absolutely, Representative. The issue here is one of sex discrimination in the wage rates. In civil rights law, we make whole the victims of sex or race discrimination. We do not try to make less whole other individuals who were not themselves the victims or the perpetrators of the injustice. There is no issue here about wage reduction. The only issue is to make sure that the complexity of the jobs that are done by either predominantly minority or predominantly female job classes warrant wage rates in relation to that complexity."
- Ropp: "Is there any provision in the Bill that then would require certain kinds of jobs to actually produce a certain amount of work based on this new classification that they might have?"
- Currie: "The Department of Central Management Services will evaluate the actual requirements of the female or minority dominated job classes and they will look then to see whether the complexity now prescribed by the Department is responsibly related to the wage rates of that job class."

Ropp: "Alright, thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Ropp: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is certainly an issue that is of major concern to some people and tragically enough, in my judgment, it is near impossible to make classifications based on one job being equal to or

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

more valuable than another. And it seems that we are only creating a mini-monster should this Bill become a reality. if this Bill passes, the potential increased costs are staggering. Not that we are opposed to providing a wage for a fair kind of work, based on the market place and kind of production that that should bring forth based on the ability of the individual, but mandatory is something that we should necessarily get involved with. The thing that is even a greater potential problem is the fact that should this get involved in the private sector, as this could very well do, we are sending the wrong signals to business who might want to consider coming into the State of Illinois and I one of the real concerns that this General Assembly has had for the last several years, attempting to jobs into our state, rather than to, should this Bill pass, telling business that we are not interested in business or the jobs that you may bring into our into our communities. And therefore, I urge all Members of this House, who are thinking Members of the future, to oppose this Bill as it is now written."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for questions?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will yield for questions."

Mautino: "Representative Currie, your legislation, as amended, provides for comparable worth in the government sector and the university setting, is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Mautino: "Last Session, when you brought this legislation to the Committee, it was drafted only for governmental employees, was it not?"

Currie: "That is correct."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Mautino: "And your response to questions in that Committee was

  that it was to be a study with implementation for
  government workers with no intention of expanding it to
  either the private sector or the university sector, was
  that not the case?"
- Currie: "My recollection, Representative, is that when the question was raised as to the private sector. I shared with you my belief that private sector wage rate issues are already covered by both federal and state civil rights laws so that there is no need for legislation affecting the private sector."
- Mautino: "Well, I respectfully disagree with that evaluation, as you know, but may I ask a question? By implementation of this legislation, what would the actual cost be to the State of Illinois for their employees and the university sector?"
- Currie: "Until we have a plan drafted by the Department of
  Central Management Services and by the State Universities
  Merit Board, it is difficult, if not impossible, to gauge
  the cost. I can tell you that the experience..."
- Mautino: "Would you say a hundred million dollars would be in the ballpark?"
- Currie: "It could... it could well be a lot less than that. The experience in cities like Los Angeles, in states like Minnesota, in other governmental units that implemented pay equity is that the cost is somewhere around two percent of the overall payroll cost. But that experience in other states. Illinois may already be further ahead in the area of pay equity than some of the states like Minnesota and Iowa and it may be that the cost to us will not be so great. But because we don't know the cost and because there is concern about cost, we introduced this Bill with a ten year period for implementation so that

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the cost factor in any one year could not, under any circumstances, be the kind of budgetary issue that would cause alarm and consternation among the taxpayers."

- Mautino: "Well, then, would you consider, in evaluating the cost, would you obtain or did you have an idea what the pension impact would be based upon the increased provisions of the compensation? Do you have any idea what that might be as well?"
- Currie: "Again, I don't think we can answer that question with any certainty until we see the plan from the Department of Central Management Service and the plan from the Merit Board. There is not, in my understanding... Minnesota, which, as I say, has already implemented pay equity, they did so, in fact, ahead of their own schedule and the sky has not fallen, nor has the economy fallen apart, nor is the state budget in disarray."
- Mautino: "May I ask this question? In your legislation, for legislative intent purposes, you are addressing comparable worth. In that regard, what classification of individuals are you addressing? Are you addressing the and I will use this only as an example class one, let's be... let's say, class one, secretarial, clerical, middle management, et cetera, with wage scales being anywhere from, let's say \$12,000 a year to \$20,000 a year, or are you addressing the area of \$20,000 to \$40,000 a year or \$40,000 to \$80,000 a year? What are you addressing?"
- is that in other understanding states that have already begun either to evaluate or to implement pav equity, the procedure is to look at the female or minority dominated job classes, whether they are low paying or In fact the answer is I don't think there are any paying. high paying female or minority dominated job classes in the State of Illinois, but they take all of the female or

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

minority dominated job classes and they look at the content of the job in each of those classes. They compare the complexity, the requirements of those jobs, with the complexity.

- Mautino: "Representative Currie, what classification financially are you addressing? The 10 to 20, the 20 to 40, or the 40 to 70? Very simple."
- Currie: "It is not... You don't choose the job classes on the basis of the pay rates. You choose the job classes to evaluate on the basis of the preponderance of the gender or the race that holds those jobs, so that the pilot study in Illinois examined a... just a sample of primarily female job categories and predominantly male job categories in order to assess the relationship across those categories of job complexity and wage rates. So, it didn't have to do with how much the job was..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Currie: "... was worth."

Mautino: "I have a few more questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I have been timing, Mr. Mautino, but proceed. I'll let you go over the limit for a moment or two, but please, bring your remarks to a close."

Mautino: "I'm keeping my questions very compact, if you'll notice, Sir."

Speaker Greiman: "I understand, but there are many people seeking recognition."

Mautino: "Alright. For example, we in the Department of Corrections have a security guard I, whether that's male or female is immaterial. The funding mechanism for that pay is whatever it is for a male or female guard, correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Mautino: "That's by contract as well as by classification with
the Department of Central Management Services. Isn't that
correct?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Currie: "Yes, let me just say that the issue..."

Mautino: "So, how do we make that any better?"

Currie: "Because the issue here is not jobs that are already sex or race integrated. The issue is that in female dominated dominated job classes studies minority in other jurisdictions and our preliminary study in Illinois suggested that although wages go up with complexity, in female dominated job classes, the wage rates are percent lower than they are across male dominated job classes, looking at the relationship between complexity and wage rates for that group. So. it's onlv the occupationally segregated job classes that are the point, the target of House Bill 678."

Mautino: "I still don't understand which jobs those are. That's

the line of my questioning. To the legislation, if I may,

Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, very briefly, please, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Ar. Speaker, I'm sorry to take the time of the House but I think it's an important issue because..."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. Sir."

Mautino: "... as Representative Ewing says, we're making policy. In my estimation, as I read the legislation, we are not making policy for evaluating and upgrading certain of the employees at lower levels. He are providing assistance higher levels of the State of Illinois through the educational system and the government employees system. But the policy we're making started a Session ago with only state employees, governmental. Today, it is in the university setting, and tomorrow, it will be in the private sector which is totally impossible to evaluate and to implement. If you are going to make a policy, I recommend most highly that we abide by contractual agreements which has been the history of this state and very agreeable with

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the employees of the State of Illinois and I'm sure of the college setting. So, I find it very difficult to establish a policy that I know, in the future — immediate future, I might add — will be assessed in the private sector that is literally impossible to implement and probably will have ramifications that we certainly don't need in this state.

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Ms. Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will. I will tell you that
we have a number of people that are seeking recognition. I
am going to try and hold everybody to five minutes, as
required by the rules. Proceed."

Parcells: "The first speaker mentioned that the clerk-typist was rated higher than the electrician in that first study and you said, 'Well, that was merely preliminary study.' Would that indicate that the second study might be different and the third study might be different and the fourth study could be yet different?"

Currie: "My suggestion was that the preliminary findings from 1983 may not be applicable to state practices in 1987. Hy second point is that this Bill requires the Department itself to do an evaluation of the job classes that are sex or race predominant and that based on that evaluation, the Department will implement equitable wage rates over a ten year period. There is a practice... in fact, people who work outside the home in this percent of the subject to these kinds of job evaluation country are Most major employers, whether governmental or systems. private sector employers, use evaluation techniques tο rationalize many items in their work forces. To use those same techniques to apply to the problem of wage based discrimination is hardly a venture outside the realm of

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

everyday experience in this country today."

Parcells: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I must oppose this I think the Sponsor is well-meaning, but this is, Bill. indeed, a remedy looking for a problem. The Sponsor has missed the problem entirely. The problem is the jobs women have traditionally chosen, not the fact that women dominate Instead of trying to compare a particular job category. unequal jobs and tinkering with the fair market which has been the backbone of our country for 200 years, this is a misguided attempt to raise women's salaries. should be encouraging women to step out of the traditional iobs and venture into new areas. The climate has been better for doctors, lawyers or engineers. Let's not discourage women by artificially raising their through some mystical voodoo formula, very inexact science. This will just hold them in their traditional jobs forever. We should instead be encouraging them to seek new horizons. Bill will simply enforce the perception that there's women's work and there's men's work and women can never get out of their mold. Every woman in this House got out of the mold and dared to run for election in a male dominated field and guess what. We won and we earn exactly what our Why discourage other women from male colleagues earn. trying to do the same thing and taking on new challenges. There is no possible way to compare a clerk-typist with an electrician or a plumber. An electrician takes his hands every day when he plays with 220 volts and the truck driver is hot and he drives for manv hours he's gone for weeks. How can you compare these jobs? You can't. But if women want those jobs, they can get them. They are hiring in all those fields. They can choose their job. job doesn't choose them. And one more thing, folks, if you vote for this Bill, you better be prepared to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

raise taxes because the cost will be enormous. Tell your constituents to have their checkbooks ready because this is big ticket item. We start at about \$130 million every year and we move up rapidly from there. And that's not When the private sector sees this cockamamie plan we all. have devised, they'll leave the state. They will know they are next on this hit list. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a classic case of looking to government to solve a problem and discovering that government is the problem. You will open a Pandora's box here that will not only hurt Illinois, but is absolutely counterproductive to women by encouraging them to stay in their traditional mold instead of embarking on new and exciting careers. I encourage your 'no' vote on this misguided legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from LaSalla, Ms. Breslin."

you, Mr. Breslin: "Thank Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, remember a few years ago when the Members of this Assembly astonished when they learned that university at the University of Illinois were paid less than maintenance engineers. At that time, there was major effort by this Assembly to increase appropriations to university system to correct that inequity. Hell, let me tell you that university professors and maintenance engineers are not the same jobs, but this Assembly was convinced that one should be paid more than the other we were offended that the world was topsy-turvy. Today, in the university system in the State of Illinois, a routeman, traditionally male dominated profession, who carries things, shuttles things from one office to another, is paid \$10.03 an hour. A secretary III in transcribing who must have advanced education is paid \$4.14. \$4.14 for a transcriber, both people who a routeman and have to feed and clothe and house their children

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

educate them the same way. The issue before you, Ladies and Gentlemen, in my view, is not an issue οf discrimination. The issue before you is the feminization This Bill does not of poverty in this state. the public sector and I would not have it affect the public... the private sector, rather. This Bill only affects This Bill says that the State of Illinois public sector. recognizes that traditionally female dominated jobs undervalued in this society and that has contributed to the feminization of poverty in this state. Many say that's left to the market place. Let the market place determine I would remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the wages. place in the United States has market traditionally discriminated. It discriminated against blacks. gave rise to equal pay for equal work in the civil movement of the 1960's and rightfully so. Equal pay for equal work won't solve the problem of pay inequities between jobs• It's my view that this state and this Assembly should set an example for private industry. Ιt shouldn't mandate this on private industry, but we should say, for ourselves, we should do it right. Pay equity is doable. It is not a phony issue. Several, several, states have already done it. The Federal several Government already has an evaluation system in place and it's been in place for 37 years. Big states and states have addressed this issue. Little states like South Dakota and West Virginia and Vermont, they were able to do Farm states like Iowa, Michigan and Wisconsin, were able to do it. Big industrial states like California and New York have been able to do it. Why not Illinois? I will close by saying don't be swayed by phony arguments. issue affects women and blacks and poverty. good Bill. Vote 'aye'."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Holf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison moves that the previous question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open. This is on the previous question that Mr... has been put. On this... take the record. question. there are 62 'ave', 45 'no', 1 'present' and the Mr. Parke... Mr. Parke. Motion fails. Now. in this Legislature, we use expressions like the learned Gentleman, the Honorable Sir, and things like that. I am bringing decorum back to this room and I have just declared the Motion failed. And Hr. Parke, you will please accommodate us by having... excuse me, excuse me. You will please continue to conduct yourself with decorum henceforth, Mr. Parke, and I admonish you from the Chair for screaming way. You were... you did receive a vote. proceeding on the discussion. The Gentleman from Morgan. Mr. Ryder. The Gentleman from Coles, Ar. Weavar."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will yield for questions."

Weaver: "As I read your Bill, the rates... over here, the rates are established by the Merit Board, correct, or through CMS? The evaluations?"

Currie: "The evaluation is done by, on the one hand, CMS, and on the other, by the Merit Board."

Weaver: "Now, if I am an employee of the state and I don't agree
with the evaluation or the number of points awarded to my
job classification, what, then, is my appeal procedure?"

Currie: "Well, I suppose you could take the state into court and sue it. Let me tell you though that the lawsuit..."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Weaver: "I'd take them to court and sue them?"

Currie: "What I am suggesting is that the lawsuits that have been filed on this issue of sex and race discrimination in this state and in other states across the country have been filed precisely because state managers have refused to take seriously their responsibilities to make sure that there is not discrimination in the pay scales. So, my sense is that CMS would do a respectable and responsible job in evaluating the extent of the problem of pay inequity in State of Illinois personnel programs and I think that their answer would be a sound and sensible, responsible one."

Weaver: "And how does seniority figure in the point system of job evaluation?"

Currie: "The kind of evaluation that's called for under the provisions of House Bill 678 is to look at the complexity of the jobs themselves. Seniority would not be affected by the evaluation techniques in this Bill."

Weaver: "So this would effectively eliminate seniority in jobs in the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "No... Sir... Wrong, Representative. What I said is that
this Bill will not interfere with seniority as a negotiated
reason for higher or lower wage rates in any individual job
class."

Weaver: "But itage"

Currie: "This will not affect the present status of seniority in the collectively bargained wage rates for any job class in the State of Illinois."

Weaver: "So, CMS will essentially set the job value and then we will come back in and negotiate on that job value? What's the point of setting the value in the first place if we are going to simply go back and renegotiate the whole thing anyway?"

Currie: "The Department of Central Management Services and the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

University Herit Board will establish the degree o f responsiblity, skill, energy, effort, know-how that goes into the performance of the jobs in the affected Based upon that evaluation. the collective bargaining process will negotiate, over a ten year period. agencies in determining what with those kinds adjustments need be made. But nothing in the Bill will undercut the present status of seniority as a measure of pay... pay rates for any individual job class."

- Weaver: "If... and the Bill is reasonably simple and short, under your Bill, should this become law, are there any provisions, once the job value is established, and there suddenly appears to be a shortage of applicants, is there anything in your Bill that would allow the state to pay more money for that job classification in order to hire the people it needs?"
- Currie: "Two things. First of all, adjustments in ranges and rates under the schedule for attaining comparable worth can be made annually. The second item is that we still involve this whole issue in the collective bargaining process. This is not done by fiat from the Governor's Office or from Central Management Services. the Department of collective bargaining agents will negotiate with those hadies tο a responsible and reasonable attain schedule."
- Weaver: "But, for example, if we have a problem in Illinois hiring computer programers, and because the market rate in the private sector has just gone out of sight for it, we have to wait a year to adjust the salary range for that job in order to hire these people? Is that..."
- Currie: "I can't believe, Representative, that the Department
  that is in charge of hiring those people would not,
  understanding the economy as well as they do, recognize

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

problems as they are appearing on the economic horizon and make sure that they are in a good position to respond at that point. Let me remind you that when there was a nurse shortage in the State of Illinois, it was the effort of some through this Assembly to make sure that we could hire a lot of people who did not meet present nursing qualifications just so that employers did not compete by raising the wages paid to the people who cared for our ill and our sick."

- Weaver: "But in terms of the private market effects on this system, if the system does adjust itself and ascribes a higher salary range for a job simply because the people are harder to get, because there is a shortage, does that mean that all other jobs that are reasonably close to that one in evaluation must also be raised?"
- Currie: "Not under the terms of this Bill. The terms οf Bill require that the job classifications be evaluated based on the evaluation of collective bargaining process will put in place to work on adjustments if the Department's plan calls for adjustments in individual classes. Let me remind you that other states are doing it, the City of Los Angeles has done it. This is not a brand new scheme that suddenly appears here in the State of Illinois with no precedent, with no background. We know that it works. We have examples of places where it and the suggestion that we can't make it work in Illinois suggests to me that you don't have the Governor and his agencies, the same kind of in our faith that I do and I know the people of this state do. in sound managerial effective and efficient run things practices."
- Weaver: "Yeah, yeah... thank you. Mr... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Weaver: "While I agree with the premise and with the idea, and perhaps it does work efficiently and effectively in other areas. the mechanics of this Bill simply prohibit it from competing with the private sector for the people that we need to work in the State of Illinois and effectively will cause more problems than it solves. The Sponsor of has already admitted that the only opportunity that people under this system have for appeal is to go to court. Now, it is not our intention in this Body. I think. provide additional jobs for attorneys, but this is what it is going to effectively do. This Body should not be in the posture of passing out incomplete or flawed legislation hopes that sometime in the future it's going to be worked out. While I agree with the premise, I think the mechanics of this Bill are seriously flawed and we need to take a little bit more time and look at it before we it out. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, As. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. I realize that emotions are running high in this chamber over this if not international issue which has received national. attention, but I would ask my colleagues if for a minute you would step back from all of the propaganda that has surrounded the name comparable worth and take a look at what it is that the Lady has actually Very simply and to the point, this Bill proposed here. suggests that we take a look at whether or not the employment system is fair . There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with opening our minds to investigation of whether or not there is fairness in the way that these institutions have been put together, in the 50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

way that employment patterns have developed over time. Whether or not the answer will come back to us that it's or not fair, fairer to some than it is to others, is really not the point. The only point is that we should We should declare it the public policy of a look. this state to take a look and see whether or not the has any clothes on. I suggest to you... I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that all that Representative Currie and the supporters of this Bill are asking us to do is to open our minds, to take a good look at what is really going on, to inform ourselves. There can never he anything wrong with information. There can never be anything wrong with taking a look and seeing whether or not we are doing the right thing. I encourage you that a 'ves' vote on this Bill is the right thing."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of To the Bill. Assembly. One of the fascinating of this Assembly is that, as the Lady just said, we may all agree with a concept. We all certainly want be fair. The two words, comparable worth, cause, I think, no major concern with anybody on either side of the aisle, the fascinating process here is that we can and do differ philosophically on how we get to a point of fairness, as the Lady from Cook just mentioned. father of a daughter, I'm certainly interested in As the husband of a working wife. I'm certainly interested in fairness for her, but there are SOME things concern me about the Bill that is currently before us. as someone mentioned earlier is The fiscal note. 128 million dollars. 128 million dollars, not paid for by the State of Illinois, which we so often like to say, paid by the taxpayers of this state who are letting all of us

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

know their feelings on taxes. That's just to get us to the level. I would submit to you then, how much more money, every time someone gets a raise, to adjust the entire Fairness? Perhaps. Can you afford that kind I have my doubts. The State of Washington has fairness? thus far spent 450 million dollars trying to implement this program. Lastly, a concern for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Would this process diminish in any way the long-fought for right to bargain wages, conditions, hours and terms of employment that many of you have fought so eloquently for for so many years? In all due respect to the Sponsor of the Bill, while fairness is. indeed. an issue that we can all identify with, I don't think this is the way to get to it. I urge a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will yield for questions."

Harris: "Yes, Representative, if I may, one of the previous speakers indicated that women were paid approximately 59 cents on the dollar to what a man is paid. Is that... is that correct?"

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie."

Currie: "The latest statistics I have seen suggest that the average, full-time, year round female woman... person working outside the home in this country today is earning 64 cents on the dollar earned by the average, full-time, male, year round employee. That figure..."

Harris: "Is that... Is that also accurate for the State of Illinois, do you know?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Harris: "Is that also accurate for the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "I do not have a state by state break down, but I would remind you that that figure has been about the same for the

#### 50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

last 50, five-oh, years, every since the Department of Labor, the United States Department of Labor, began keeping statistics on wage rates by gender in the United States work force. He have seen little change, never mind the Civil Rights Act, over that period."

- Harris: "Do you know what the average monthly payroll is for females in the State of Illinois, average monthly paycheck, rather?"
- Currie: "For the full... the full work force? I don't have that statistic, but I can tell you... I can tell you that for State of Illinois employees, &6 percent of the women who work for State Government earn \$16,000 or less. Only 14 percent of our male employees earn a salary that small."
- Harris: "You indicated, I believe, in response to one of the earlier questions, that you felt that the cost would probably be about two percent of the total payroll, is that correct?"
- Currie: "The experience in states like Hinnesota, cities like Los

  Angeles, is that somewhere around two percent of payroll is
  the ultimate cost of implementing pay equity."
- Harris: "Do you know what the payroll is..."
- Currie: "Other states are in the process and I can't give you figures from them."
- Harris: "Do you know what the payroll is in the State of Illinois?"
- Currie: "I don't have that figure in front of me."
- Harris: "Okay. One final question I have, you indicated that the... a study is to be done and I believe that's conducted by Central Management Services. The example was drawn of, I believe, an electrician and a stenographer or something along those lines. One might receive 220 points, one might receive 280 points. You said that if there was a large difference there that then CMS would make some final

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

determination as to how they would rate it."

Currie: "Through the collective bargaining process."

Harris: "I see. Okay."

Currie: "The adjustments themselves would be made through collective bargaining."

"Thank you. To the Bill. Mr. Harris: Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just a couple of additions to the questions which 1 asked the Sponsor. The State Λf Illinois, as you well know, has in its Constitution anti-discrimination on the basis of sex provision anyway. The State of Illinois happens to be a leader. At this point right now, happens to be ... "

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. Proceed, Sir. You had completed your five minutes, but proceed. Turn Mr. Harris on."

Harris: "Thank you very much. The State of Illinois happens to be a leader in nondiscrimination in terms of payroll. In the State of Illinois right now, the average paycheck for a female, a monthly paycheck, is \$1700. The average monthly paycheck for a male is 20... \$2000. Yes, there is some difference, but it is not nearly as great as what has been purported. It is not 59 cents to the dollar, but rather is 81 and a half cents to the dollar. We are indeed already moving in the right direction."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Harris: "Let's look at the question ... one final point, if I may. Let's look at the question of cost. The Sponsor herself indicated that the estimated cost is two percent of Ladies and Gentlemen, the average payroll the... not the average, the payroll in the State of Illinois is 1.6 billion dollars. I am nat a mathematic great, but I'll tell you two percent of 1.6 billion is 320 million, it's not 130. There is a serious problem here terms of this Bill. It deserves a 'no' vote and we should

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

not at this time move in this direction. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Hr. Young."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of Young: House. I rise just, I quess, in response to a few of the comments that have been made during this debate. First all, one of the previous speakers mentioned that this was a phony issue. Well. I certainly somewhat of exception to that and I'd like to just list some of the organizations who do not think this is a phony issue and who, in fact, have come out in support of this issue. Thev include the Illinois Nurses Association, the Illinois Religious Network for Equality for Women, the Illinois State Division. American Association of University Women, the Chicago National Organization for Women. the Chicago Nurses Association, the Coalition of Labor Union Women, the Latino Institute, the League of Women Voters of Illinois, Springfield National Organization for Homen. the AFI-CIO. AFSCME Council 31, AFSCME Local 1271 and I could stand here my whole five minutes reading the list of groups who have organized in support of this issue, but I think I have said enough on that point. One of the previous speakers mentioned that... the cost to the State of Washington. Well. one reason that it cost Washington so much is because they were taken to court and lost to implement this program, but had to implement back wages and most of the large sums of money he mentioned were back wages implemented because the court i t ordered because Washington wouldn't willingly comply. I'd like to emphasize, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we are already in In 1983, a Federal Court found us court on this issue. guilty of sex based discrimination. If we don't implement legislation at this time, we lend ourselves to the possibility of getting hit for back wages and more damages

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

than we now might already face. And finally, I'd just like to ask your support for this legislation and emphasize again it's not a phony issue. It's an issue whose time has already come. It's an issue that we are currently in litigation, and it's an issue whose price tag, regardless of how large it is now, is only going to grow and grow and grow if this issue is... implementation of pay equity is forced on us by the courts. So, let's not make the courts force us to do what we all know, in good conscience, should have been done some time ago."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she'll yield for questions."

Peterson: "Representative, could you tell me if women faculty
members of our institutions of higher learning will be
affected if this legislation passes?"

Currie: "I believe that the employees that are in the... in House Bill 678 are the nonacademic employees, those that are under the control of the Herit Board. Similarly, members in State Government do not fall under provisions of this Bill, for they are not under the direction o f the Department of Central Management Services."

Peterson: "Okay, so those professional instructors and professors are not covered by this particular piece of legislation?"

Currie: "That is my understanding."

Peterson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I think it's somewhat naive to presume that if this
kind of legislation is passed that the next step would not
go to the private sector. I think that is something
that is a reality and I think that is one of the reasons

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

why we see such union support for this kind of legislation. In addition, it's been alluded a number of times in the conversations here on the floor that Minnesota has pointed to as a state that has implemented this and is doing so well with it. I might point out to the Members of this Body that the personal income tax in the State of Minnesota is between six and seven percent which is a heavy burden that the taxpayers of that state must bear and that one of the reasons that they are having such a high personal income tax is because of the implementation of this kind of legislation. I might also say that last month I was talking to some citizens from Minnesota who stated many of the jobs of Minnesota are leaving. going to other states because it is an unhealthy business climate there. I will also say that when you lose business in a state and you have government services that must be provided, there is only one place that you can seek new tax revenues and that must be on the backs of the taxpayers that state. Minnesota recently enacted a T submit that if we pass this legislation that what has been proposed for a tax increase will be small potatoes compared to what will have to be asked for a year or two years from now to implement these I don't believe the kind programs. taxpavers of sent the Legislators down here to implement these kind of high tax, high expense programs. You know, we only have a dollar of state tax revenue to spend and we talking about this is a Bill that is going to upgrade minorities and women's issues. Well, I might want to point out to you, with this dollar that we have, we can only spend it so many ways. I think that if you pass this kind of legislation, this is an unwise way of spending that dollar because I think we can implement so many other

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

worthwhile programs for women and minorities that are going to do a much better job than implementing a program this that we have no negotiation rights on. It's just something that's going to be there to try and raise the might also point out that I have the level of pay. I fiscal note in front of me, and the fiscal note says implement this program next year, to just get it up to the level of what comparable worth, according to this will implement will cost the taxpavers of Illinois \$72,000,000. That's just to get it up based on what it I might also point out, as was mentioned earlier, the university employees of Illinois are not even included in this Bill, to give you an idea of the kind of tax going to be sticking on the taxpayers of Illinois. This is an unwise Bill. I don't think it's going to the job that the Sponsor wants to do. This \$72,000,000 for next year alone, I might point out is just part of the phase-in program. This is a ten year program. Can vou imagine what it's going to cost the taxpayers of Illinois over the course of the next 10 years if \$72,000,000 is just next year's cost for implementing it? I think this is an unwise Bill. I think the taxpayers of Illinois are anina give you a voice in the next couple of months saying we are tired of taxes, and I think this will just increase taxes in Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask if this Bill does get the required number of votes that we have a Roll Callo"

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Pederson."

Pederson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When the Representative gave us our litany a little while ago, the long list of groups that's for this Bill, I think most of us recognize it as a list that wants more government in almost everything we do. And I think that

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

are for it because they expect that this concept will be extended into the private sector and further their government goals. And the other thing is that we hear this business about the State of Washington. Actually, the State of Washington won that case and the reason they up with all that money is because the Legislature panicked and got real nervous and started putting thing into effect and going... making up for past years and spending all this money. It's really a sign of... I guess you would call it legislative ineptitude. This type legislation, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, puts into a system that is very subjective. It eliminates the supply and demand aspects. It really creates a big can of WORMS We \* 11 be fussing around with with government and bureaucrats and judges for years. It sends the wrong signal to the private sector and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Αn opponent of House 3ill 678 suggests that the remedy in search of a problem. The problem, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that women working outside the home in this country today earn 60 percent of the wages of men working full-time year-round outside the home today. The problem, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that percent of the women who work outside the home in this country today work in a handful of low paying professions. They work as nurse, as secretary, as day care worker, as librariana The problem, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. is that wages for those jobs are artificially undervalued because in this society, women's work has not been worth very much. I believe the laborer is worthy of his or her hire and I believe that we, as state government, have a responsibility to the people who work for US a We

a responsibility to see to it that their wage rates

50th Legislative Day

May 20 • 1987

are equal to the work we extract from them. That's all in House Bill 678, an effort to see that that's involved complex jobs performed by women and minorities equivalent to that complexity to the value of the work that they do for us. It's been suggested that can't afford this Bill. One opponent mentioned the figure \$72,000,000. He. I believe, misread the fiscal note from the Department of Central Management Services. There minimal cost in this Bill next year to work the provisions of House 3ill 678 and any substantive dollars that might be spent to adjust wage rates will be spent over the next ten the full cost is \$72,000,000, 7.2 million dollars a year to ensure fair wage rates for the women minorities working for us in state government is hardly too a price to pay. Can we afford not to do pay equity? Can we afford to say to the women and children of \* He will continue balancing our budgets on your Can we continue to pay for the costs of an wage system, the costs we pay through an expanded welfare program. Our taxpayers are footing the Bill right now for our failure to see to it that we set the kind of example that we in state government must set, to see to it that nobody in this society is unfairly victimized by virtue of race and sex discrimination. House Bill 678 assumes are opposed already to sex and race discrimination. House Bill 678 merely ensures that we do not stand watchdog over a pay system in state government that encourages. and continues instances of race and sex promotes discrimination. I urge your support for House Eill 678." Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. The Gentleman

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens, one minute to explain your vote."

- Stephens: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. I'm afraid that the might have closed on the wrong Bill there. We started talking about some very tangential issues. The fact of the matter is that we ought to follow the lead of private and not try to lead them down a primrose path. This is social engineering. This is the way they do it if you want... if This 15... you believe in socialism, you believe in this issue. If you want to make the cost of government go up, then vote 'yes'. If you want... if you believe in responsible government, i f believe in the cost of government ought to be held in check, then you ought to be voting 'no'. I vote 'no'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sutker, one minute to explain your vote."
- Sutker: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. I'd like to explain my vote because I think this is a very significant piece of legislation and I'd like to point out to all people here on both sides of the aisle that the State of Illinois has an obligation to lead the way and not to follow. If private sector does follow, may I suggest to you it will follow because what is done here is right today and we will have led the entire state to show that this Assembly is concerned by all of the people and where we know injustices occur, we have acted. I vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While it is... just for the record, while it is my wish not to vote on anything that affects the economic interests of universities, the... I note that the University of Illinois has not taken a

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

position on this Bill, and therefore, I feel free to vote

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, one minute to explain your vote."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this Bill and I want to comment on one of the remarks made by a previous who said that the State of Illinois cannot afford this kind Hell, you know, when we, in this country, legislation. did away with slavery that could be conceived of as costing the taxpayer a great deal of money. This, I suppose, may cost the taxpayers some money, but it is doing what is right, what is long overdue, to say that we. should what they are worth regardless of whether they are women is what this organization, this Assembly ought to be about. So, I'd like to see a lot more red... green votes up there and I vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, one minute to explain your vote."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, really know what the cost of this legislation will be, but I suggest to you that the more costly it is. the more guilty we are of discriminating unfairly against half of our population in the state. I don't want to have mν conscience a vote that indicates that I am not fairness. If, in fact, it is a costly program it is because we have failed to live up to our duty in the past and we should take that responsibility immediately and forward from here to adjust it as rapidly as we can possibly afford to do that. As was indicated earlier, should not wait for a court suit to which we are compelled to respond. We should take the responsibility into our own hands, as a responsible legislative Body to see

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- inequities that are found to exist are eradicated. I proudly vote 'yes' for this legislation."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McCracken... Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."
- McCracken: "Just to seek a verification if this appears to get the requisite number of votes."
- Speaker Greiman: "That's already been requested. Thank you. Mr.

  Parke made that request. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Flowers,

  one minute to explain your vote."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the previous speakers stated that there are so many other things that can be done for women and minorities as opposed to passing House Bill 678. I rise up into opposition to his statement. If this Bill passes, we will not need any favors. We will be able to get it ourselves because we will have equal pay for equal work. And I would urge the passage of House Bill 678. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Stern, one minute to explain your vote."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have been mulling over something that was said early in the debate about we women who are in the House have earned our way here. HA worked for it, we got elected and I think it behooves us to different way than the Member who made that hehave in statement. I think we represent the aspirations thousands, millions of women and I think it is on us, the incubus of this is on us to be Leaders in matter. I was, at one time, the sole support of four small children and I can tell you this is a matter that means something to me and I think it should mean something every woman in this House, as well as to every man who cares about fair play and that famous old clicke, the even playing field. I urge your 'aye' vote."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and the Bill fails. Yes, Ms. Currie, were you seeking recognition? On this Order appears House Bill 810. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 810, a Bill for an Act in relation to plant closings and relocations. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich, on House Bill 810."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 810 creates the Labor Management Notification and Consultation Act. What this Bill does is aimed at the problem of plant closings and relocation. T t affects the industrial and commercial facilities that have at least 50 employees, which previous Bills have been 25 which business had a problem with so we raised it to 50. it was 25 at one time. Employer gives 90 days advance notice to employees and government agencies. Αt one time, the Bill read 180 days. We went down to 90. Δn employer consults with employees in good faith and with certain exceptions, discloses relevant information to their It establishes a job prevention task force and it also creates a council for economic adjustment. move for passage of this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich,
  moves for the passage of House Bill 810, and on that, the
  Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hould the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Didrickson: "Sam, plant closing legislation."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Panayotovich: "Yes, Ma'am."

Didrickson: "Hhat's the situation with the neighboring states around us right now? Do they have it?"

Panayotovich: "I'm not familiar with the other states around us."

Didrickson: "Have... Hell, have you done any..."

Panayotovich: "I'm concerned with Illinois."

Didrickson: "Have you done any research to know whether Indiana,

Missouri, Iowa has plant closing legislation on the books?

Panayotovich: "No. I think it's more concern we worry about Illinois."

Didrickson: "How about in the country? Do we have any statistics on who or who doesn't have plant closing or industrial hostage legislation on the books?"

Panayotovich: "I imagine... plant closing legislation, I imagine
there is a study, but to me, again, I am worried just about
Illinois."

Didrickson: "In other words, you don't know."

Panayotovich: "In other words, I don't know."

Didrickson: "He... okay, we could be setting land... we could be blazing trails here and setting landmark legislation in Illinois with this Bill?"

Panayotovich: "Yes, this would be a great thing to do."

Didrickson: "Okay. In Section 2, there are some requirements of the employer with regards to... well, let's talk about having to open up the books, you know. What does that mean? What do we have to do when we open up the books?"

Panayotovich: "Yeah, the way the Bill reads is they should provide relevant information to employees, the union."

Didrickson: "Doesn't that mean opening up the books?"

Panayotovich: "What it means is what we are trying to do is open up the books for DCCA and the Governor to be able to do their job to find out possibly if we can save that plant."

Didrickson: "And the employees and everybody else?"

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Panayotovich: "Yes, and their officials, yes."

Didrickson: "How about trade secrets?"

Panayotovich: "I believe there is a provision guarding trade secrets. Section  $B_{\bullet}$ "

Didrickson: "Well, I... we interpret it as meaning that it would have to be disclosed. Don't tell anybody else, but it would have to be disclosed."

Panavotovich: "We... we interpret..."

Didrickson: "On page 3, we talk about a mutually satisfactory alternative to plant closings. What does this mean?"

Panayotovich: "Well, our feeling would be keeping the plant opening... mutually satisfactory to both."

Didrickson: "So, if the employees don't agree to keeping it open,

I mean, do we close it or if they don't agree to close it,

do we keep it open or what does that mean? How do we then

decide mutually?"

Panayotovich: "Hell, what we are looking for is a possibility of DCCA being able to come in and work out some agreements and work with both the labor and business community to try to keep the plant open. What we want to do is work out an agreement with DCCA and the Governor. What this Bill does is it's actually letting the Governor and DCCA do their job a little more efficiently."

Didrickson: "They already do this."

Panavotovich: "Questionable."

Didrickson: "I am told they do. What is DCCA's position on this

Panayotovich: "I don't know. You can ask the Gentleman behind you, I think."

Didrickson: "Okay. Hell, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

Didrickson: "Call it what you want. Call it plant closing legislation, which we see up on the board, or as the

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

business community calls it, industrial hostage Bill. It's appropriate. I think, the industrial hostage Bill. tells an employer that he or she cannot close or relocate without the employees permission. It tells an emplover because you cannot afford to stay open Illinois won't necessarily let you close. This says, 'Let's see what employees think. Are you really broke. Are Employer or Ms. What's in your books, you employer? Employer? Onen them secrets included. We're going disclose trade t o those. This RIII robs an employer of his entrepreneurial discretion. You know, and this may like a real conservative strike, but it really strikes at the heart of free enterprise. If you can't even shut down. what else can they take from you in the State of Illinois? Representative Panavotovich is very sensitive to plant closing in his district. I'm going to tell you, so am Τ. My district is a neighboring district. I'm in the same SDA as he does... is. We have seen more plant closings outside than anywhere else in this state, but that's because we are reliant of smoke stack industries state and in our particular districts. That's a problem, but you can't hold every Illinois employer hostage because you are reliant on smoke stack industries. What we need to do is encourage new industries to come in here and what you doing with this Bill is sending the death knell to doing business in the State of Illinois. You are going actually discourage those new industries from coming in here to replace those that need to be replaced. You know, this is supposed to be an employee Bill, and I suppose, if you look at it in a vacuum, it's an employee Bill. addresses the employee. In the real world, that's not what we live in. We live in... we live not on theory, but we live in the practical way. I don't think anybody here

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

really believes that because wе enact plant closing legislation that we are going to prevent plants closing in the State of Illinois. I suggest to you that we don\*t blaze new trails in Illinois. need t o Our unemployment figures are going up. The nation's are going I submit to you, enough's enough. Vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook.

Mr. LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I feel it's more than right to give the employees of any company notice of plant closure. I rise in support of this Bill. I feel, the years, we have had hundreds of companies in the over State of Illinois who have closed their doors and given prior notice to their employees. I feel the employees are being treated wrong. I feel it is about high time that inform them that they are about to lose their incomes where depend on in supporting their family each and every He have employees of many of these dav. companies have closed their doors in the State of Illinois who have families, who have children in schools. When you close... when a person... when the plants close, that means that bread is taken from the tables and I feel that DCCA and the Governor should go on record and investigating any company who is about to close their doors. is aboutees therefore, I would like to seek as many green votes on this Bill as possible. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think when we consider labor legislation or legislation that comes out of the Labor and Commerce Committee that we have to figure that there are actually three power groups involved. One is the employers, the people who supply the money and the plant

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

and supply the work for the workers to do. The second is labor and that we understand is the people who perform the and that is their share of the agreement. group is government and if government power takes position on the side of either of the two primary parties, they throw the whole balance of the employer/employee relationship out of balance. Now, when company of business, there There is the necessity for bringing the work in necessarv. and there is the labor that's necessary. And when the time comes that the income to the company drops off, the employer is the one who has to make up the salary he can pay wages during hard times. Sometimes, he even has borrow money in order to carry his employees. And then along comes a time when we pass legislation like this the employer says to himself or to the other members of his board of directors, 'We can no longer take the liability upon ourselves of borrowing money to cover through what might be an extended period of time. have to lay employees off as the work falls because would be allowed to lay off individual employees. Never in any of this labor/employer relationship have I heard a suggestion that when a time comes when a company is financially that perhaps stressed the laborers would contribute some money towards the cost of operating In all fairness, if you want to protect your jobs, really, you should... you should contribute something towards helping to keep the company open and if you insist on not contributing to solving the problem, vou are contributing to making the problem. The problem with labor today in its relationship with the employers is that everything guaranteed for want them. They the want employer to provide them wages when there is a shortage ٥f

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

and now they want the employer to know 90 to 180 days before he has run out of money that he is going to run out He has no... no alternative when the money is of money. gone but to close down and this kind of legislation is going to make it imperative for many businesses that are in shaky condition to take the easy way out and either give the equipment to the employees and walk out or just abandon the whole thing to the government. Neither one of them can do the job that management is required to do. but of them is willing to let management do their own job in the way that they see fit. This is bad piece of legislation. It is bad for the workers. It is bad for the It is bad for the State of Illinois as a whole employers. and I think that the opportunity that actually it is that we consider employers and their position in labor problems and let's try to be helpful rather than stumbling blocks in the way of the employers of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative
Kirkland, on the question. Representative Kirkland.

Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Alright, thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have problems with this Bill and will vote against it. One of the reasons our national economy is... and the private sector is so vigorous is because of the freedom of movement that is allowed for businesses to move around the country to adjust to various economic factors to do with their individual industries. And I just think this sets up too much of a barrier that, as another Representative said, would cause businesses to pause before coming to this state. I think the collective bargaining process, whether in Illinois or in any other part of the country, is a very

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

adequate process to address these kinds of issues. guess I'd further add that there's just a myriad, a myriad of reasons why businesses at any one time or another move from one part of this country to another and we in ways to make the Illinois economy manv more attractive to businesses that we'd like to attract here and more attractive to businesses that we would like to think this legislation would make the state less attractive and if enacted here and/or in other would make our national economy much less dynamic and So, for that reason, I urge a vote against the successful. legislation... against the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Stange, on the question. Representative Stange."

Thank you. Madam Speaker. If the State of Stange: you. Illinois is trying to attract new business from other states, the State of Illinois is trying to attract new business from other countries that come here. thev going to look at this Bill and it's going to be... it's going to be very embarrassing for the State of Illinois to get these companies here. In my district. in other districts, companies have called me and they 100 percent oppose this Bill. I urge your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. It's just one more way to hamstring business in the State of Illinois. How can requiring an employer to stay open possibly help? The employer is in the business to make money too. He's not closing to be mean. He wants to make a living. He's obviously figured out he can't make money. The provisions of this Bill are already covered by DCCA. The Sponsor cannot tell us what other state has it, so once again, Illinois becomes the experimental guinea pig

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

in this field, we'll discourage new business from coming
in. It's a bad Bill and I seek your 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pederson."

Peterson: "Yes, Representative Peterson, Ms... Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Peterson."

"Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this... Peterson: that most employers don't want know tο go out of business. They're trying to stay alive. And when you require that they give 90 day notice of their... closing, you are really making it harder for them alive. Advance notice can lead to loss of customers. inability to get credit and the departure of key employees. These tend to hasten the business collapse with consequently employment loss. The Bill Sponsors here are really saying, 'Well, I think this would help employees. It might hurt the employer a little bit, but let's give it What we need in Illinois is to make it place to do business. Like, you know, lower taxes, less obstructionism, that kind of thing. So. I would urge a "no" vote on this bad piece of legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke." Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year Representative Panavotovich invited me a meeting that he held in his district in the Hegewisch area and I had the opportunity, first listen to what it meant to a community, to individual employees, to lose the company in which they were many years. And I can understand Representative Panayotovich's initiative with this Bill because truly a tragedy in his district what happened. But I think we have to look beyond that particular instance. I think we have to look at what we will do to employees throughout

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the State of Illinois if we pass this kind of legislation. I think the intent of what Representative Panayotovich to do is worthwhile; however, I believe wants far. I believe it will legislation has gone too he counterproductive to the employees of Illinois because it truly will send a negative voice to the business community around the United States who may be looking to relocate in Illinois, to hire a skilled work force and to put more people back to work. I think there are parts οf Panayotovich's Bill that Representative are dood and business should take a hard look at what some οf these things are and work with Representative Panayotovich to come up with a compromise that we all can live with. Unfortunately, I have to vote 'no' on this. I think every Member of the General Assembly should vote \*no\* on this. but should work and encourage Representative Panayotovich to continue his efforts to try and come up solution and a compromise that will help both business and employees of Illinois."

Speaker Breslin: The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Sutker: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Bill. I notice the Bill has taken o f being employer versus employee and that's unfortunate because I'm sure Representative Panayotovich dealing with that alone. This Bill encompasses more than just an employer and employee relationship. T+ relates to the community in which the employer operates. An employer should be as obligated to give notice to his employee as he is obligated to give notice to his landlord. would only enforce cooperation, a cooperation This Bill that should be there without the necessity of the Bill, but unfortunately, employers are choosing to sneak away in the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

night, having given notice to the landlord, but failed to give notice to their community or to their employees. This Bill transcends the employer/employee relationship and, tadies and Gentlemen, I urge an "aye" vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the main question is put. Representative Panayotovich, to close."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of In listening to all the discussion that's went the House. on here, let's take this back a little bit. This Bill presented here for a few years. We heard the word compromise from Representative... previous Representative about compromise. This Bill, at one time, had 180 days. The business community was all upset about brought it down to 90 days. davs. The business community was also worried about the employer contribution community assistance programs. He pulled that out of the Bill. He brought the Bill to 50 employees. Hе are compromising. We are working together. We also talk about another Representative mentioned about being in the district. Let me take you back to the district me take you back to your district. 3000 people at Wisconsin Steel were given checks on a Friday evening, told that the plant is closing, they are through. Not only they not have a job that they cannot put food on the table, checks were bad, the benefits were gone. back to your district and tell your people that you don't want that 90 day notification. And that's all it's saying,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

want a notification. There's no penalty for the plant to close. We are not penalizing you to close your plant. notification and we're asking for asking consultation. We want to give the Governor, we want to give DCCA the opportunity to prevent this plant closing and with this notification, we can do that. We had the hearings in the district, as Representative Parke said, and after that hearing, he should have took it a step We went out and we had lunch with the Aembers that were there and the business community and we talked about it and they all said, in one way or another, that it is wrong to take somebody and close the plant on them. This could be the biggest change in ... it should be the biggest change in somebody's life that they no longer have a iob. thev no longer have a salary and you mean to tell me an employer can't give somebody 90 days to let them try to save their lifestvle? We have approximately eight other states that have this type o f legislation. Massachusetts Connecticut have it and just the other day, the U. S. Senate Labor Committee, by a vote of 11 to 5 passed out a plant closing Bill with six months notice. That's 180. We're asking for 90. This is people. This is people that need to provide and I ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 810 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Representative... The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Piel, one minute to explain your vote.

Representative Piel. Mr. Electrician, would you turn on

Representative Piel's switch?"

Piel: "Well, maybe my minute will be over by the time he turns it

Speaker Breslin: "I'll start you over, Sir."

Piel: "Just a... just a couple of comments, Madam Speaker.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

During the debate. the Sponsor was asked if he knew how many states. He said not to the best of his knowledge during the closing, he mentions eight. It was too then I don't know if there was some certain pressure on had. the Sponsor of the Bill where, initially, I quess it was 15 Now, it's 50 employees. I quess certain businesses throughout the state would be affected if it was just 15 employees. But, you know, I think you should think long and hard about this situation and the i + \* c effects going to have on the state if you do put this type of legislation in. I'd ask for a 'no' vote and I would also, Madam Speaker... Madam Speaker, I would ask... Speaker, I would ask for a verification should this receive the required number."

- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Is there any further discussion?

  Hearing none, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no' and none voting 'present' and Representative Piel has asked for a verification of the affirmative roll. Representative...

  Representative Panayotovich has asked for a Poll of the Absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting. Flinn and McGann. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "For what reason do you seek recognition, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Just to save time, we are not going to allow any leave.

  He'll get this over with real quickly and we'll go on to
  the next Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has indicated that he is not going to allow... give permission for leave on this verification, Ladies and Gentlemen, so please be in your seats. He'll operate under Hannahan's Rules. All Hembers be in your seats. Hr. Clerk, poll the affirmative."

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "Berrios. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brunsvolda Bugielski. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Daley. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Currie. Dunn. Farley. Flowers. Gialio. Giorgi. Granberg. Greiman. Hannia. Huff. Hartke Homer. Jonesa Keane-Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levina Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahev. Novak. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite, Shaw, Steczo, Stern. Sutker Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. ₩hite. ₩illiams. Holf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Young. And Ar. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the affirmative?"

Piel: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Jim Keane. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Piel: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio is in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. Is the Gentleman in the chamber. The Gentleman is not recorded as voting, Sir."

Piel: "Okay, Van Duyne."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne is in his chair."

Piel: "McNamara."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara is in the chamber.

Representative Keane has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Piel: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite. Helen
Satterthwaite. Is the Lady in the chamber? She is not.

Remove her from the Roll Call."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Piel: "Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton. Representative John
  Cullerton. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove
  him from the Roll Call."
- Piel: "Representative McPike."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike. Representative Cullerton has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Representative McPike is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative O'Connell, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- O'Connell: "Leave to be verified."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell asks leave to be verified, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "We answered that at the beginning, no. Representative

  Greiman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell, Representative Piel denies your request for leave to be verified.

  Representative Piel, do you have any further questions of the affirmative?"
- Piel: "Representative Greiman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman. Representative Alan Greiman. The Gentleman... Representative Greiman has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'ave'."
- Piel: "Representative Levin."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin. Ellis Levin. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."
- Piel: "Representative Phelps. I see him. Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi is in the chamber."
- Piel: ™Representative Brunsvoldo"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold is in the chamber."

50th Legislative Day Hay 20, 1987

Piel: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Daley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley is in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Representative McPike has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Representative Myvetter Younge asks leave to be verified. Does the Lady have leave, Mr. Piel?"

Piel: "No."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge, Representative Wyvetter
Younge, Representative Piel denies your leave to be
verified. Do you have any further questions of the
affirmative?"

Piel: "I asked Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo is in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff is right up here on the podium."

Piel: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative John Dunn. Representative John Dunn. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative McGann, for what reason do you rise?"

McGann: "Madam Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Breslin: "You are not recorded as voting, Sir."

McGann: "Hould you kindly vote me 'aye'?"

Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative McGann as voting 'aye'."

Piel: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich. Representative Dunn has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Representative Hicks, for what reason do you rise? Representative Hicks wishes to change his vote from

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- 'no' to 'aye'. Ellis Levin has returned to the chamber.
  Add him to the Roll Call. Any further questions?"
- Piel: "I only had one more and that was Representative Breslin, so I won't ask that. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 49
  voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and this Bill,
  having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
  declared passed. Representative Braun in the Chair."
- Speaker Braun: "House Bill 2031, Representative Farley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2031, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to public employees. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Farley."
- Farley: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2031 is strictly a shell or vehicle Bill that we would like to pass over to the Senate. We have had a couple of meetings on some subject matter. We are going to have another one next Hednesday and I would appreciate at this time just passing this Bill out."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2031, and on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2031 pass?' A11 vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. This is final favor action. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'ave'. 19 voting \*no\* • and House Bill 2031. having received the Constitutional Hajority, is hereby declared passed. House 2084, Mr... Representative Peterson. Mr. Clerk, read Bill the 3ill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2084, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Braun: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I request leave to bring back House Bill 2084 to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I object."

Speaker Braun: "Gentleman has objected. For what reason does

Representative Van Duyne rise?"

Van Duyne: "Thank you, thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just like to ask Representative Dunn to remove his objection. This is... Representative Peterson and I think this is very necessary for the townships. We inadvertently left this out of the Bill and it defies logic to have people out working for the township on workfare and not authorize the townships to cover them under workmen's compensation. It could be a disaster if somebody would get hurt and sue the township. So, I would please ask him to remove his objection."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Did the Representative remove his objection?"

Speaker Braun: "No, Sir. You will have to move to have the Bill returned. It requires 60 votes."

Peterson: "Okay, I move... I so move, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved that the Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted? On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. The Motion carries.

The Bill will be returned to the Order of Second Reading.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2084, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment \$2, offered by

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Representative Peterson."

Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake,

Representative Peterson, on Amendment 2."

Peterson: "Withdraw Amendment 2. Madam Speaker."

Speaker Braun: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Braun: "Third Reading."

Peterson: "Madam Speaker, there is... Amendment 3 has been filed, if the Clerk please check the records."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment # ... "

Speaker Braun: "Alright... Mr. Clerk, the Bill will be returned to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Now, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 33, offered by Representative Peterson."

Speaker Braun: "Gentleman from Lake, on Amendment #3."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. It's a very clear and concise Amendment which does
become the Bill. It provides that the township board of
trustees may expend monies for workers' compensation
coverage for individuals who qualify for township general
assistance and who participate in a job training or work
program. I ask for your favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment

3 and on that, is there any discussion? There being none,
the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?'... oh, the
Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just one quick question. Does that then shift the financial obligation from the county to the township? Is that what we are doing?"

Peterson: "No, has nothing to do with the county."

Regan: "Well, don't the workfare people... aren't they coming out of the county and aren't they covered by..."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Peterson: "No, this is strictly workfare people under the auspices of general assistance run by the township."

Regan: "Thank you."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien "No further Amendments."

Speaker Braun: "Third Reading. Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said before, the
Amendment becomes the Bill and I ask for your favorable
vote on House Bill 2084 as amended."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Peterson, you move... you so move."

Peterson: "Immediate consideration."

Speaker Braun: "Right. Gentleman has move for immediate consideration of this Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien "House Bill 2084, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Braun: "Gentleman from Lake on House Bill 2084."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Once again, I ask for your favorable vote on House Bill 2084."

Speaker Braun: "As soon as the Clerk has had a chance to change the board. The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2084, and on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2084 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and House Bill 2084, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- passed. House Bill 2493, Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien "House Bill 2493, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2493 as amended requires the Department of Veterans' Affairs to report to the General Assembly twice a year regarding their staffing ratios in direct care at veterans' homes. This simply brings us up to... closer to compliance with the U. S. Veterans' Administration. I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill... Representative Curran, have you concluded your remarks? That's what I thought. House... the Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2493, and on that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."
- Hallock: "I think this is a laudable concept, but I am concerned about the impact fiscally. Will this require the Department to hire more people or how will this be implemented?"
- Curran: "He do not believe there will be any cost for this,

  Representative. It requires the Department to report to us

  to give us an idea of how far off we are. He think we're

  pretty far off, but we'd like to know."
- Hallock: "So this Bill, as it sits today, does not require them to employ more people? It just requires them to make a study to find out whether they have enough people?"
- Curran: "They are to report to us twice a year regarding their patient... staff to patient ratio in direct care

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

facilities. That would be Quincy and Manteno, I believe."

Hallock: "And then once we have received that report, are there further steps to be followed?"

Curran: "At that point, we would be enlightened."

Hallock: "Hell, we surely could use that enlightenment on a constant basis. Are there suggested staff ratios that you would use as your criteria for ascertaining whether or not we are in fact over or understaffed?"

Curran: "The U. S. Veterans' Administration has a ratio of 2.0 to

1, so that would be the ratio that we would be comparing
ourselves against, but if we don't... but this particular
Bill simply requires the Department to tell us twice a year
how close we are to that."

Hallock: "Then I assume it's probably your intention pursuant to that study if we are understaffed to put in a Bill to increase the staff?"

Curran: "Actually, this Bill came from Representative Pangle.

Since he is no longer here, I am carrying it for him. His wife, who is a nurse, is very familiar with a set of circumstances in and around Manteno and I think it was her wisdom in light of that specific situation that was the genesis of this legislation."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Sangamon to close."

Curran: "Please vote for this good Bill."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays, for what reason do you rise?"

Mays: "I just have a question of the Sponsor. I don't know if it's appropriate at this point. I know you want to move on, but, Representative, is this..."

Speaker Braun: "Representative..."

Mays: "Thank you very much. Madam Speaker... is..."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Braun: "Well, I don't mind, but, Representative, your light didn't go on until after the Gentleman had closed and you were on the telephone so for Representative McCracken's future edification, I am more than fair to your side of the aisle. Proceed, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Representative, is this... this was Chuck Pangle's Bill, is that not correct, and at the time this was going through Committee, Representative Pangle and the Department entered into some negotiations on the staffing portion of this Bill and is the Amendment that is on this Eill the Department's Amendment?"
- Curran: "Jeff, I do not know anything about those... the
  conversation that Representative Pangle had with the
  Department. I'm sorry. I just don't know the answer to
  that."
- Mays: "Well, then, would you be..."
- Curran: "I'm told by... excuse me. I'm told by staff that it is.

  I don't know that independently, but staff tells me that that is the case."
- Mays: "Okay, well, on that basis then, I rise in support of the Bill. I would like to make sure at some point when it's over in the Senate that the Department's concerns were addressed and if I can have that assurance, I think we can move right along. I think this Amendment is the Department's Amendment."
- Curran: "It seems to me that what happened with the Amendment is that it changed from reporting four times a year to reporting two times a year. The Department was in favor of reporting only twice a year."
- Mays: "And the Department also has some concerns, I believe, with some specific staffing requirements that were in the original Bill, that I think the Amendment took care of also."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Curran: "Staff tells me that that is the case, that you are correct."
- Mays: "Well, okay. There are some questions on the Bill. At this point, though, I believe this Bill has been amended to address some of the major concerns of the Department, and with the Sponsor's assurance that the Department's considerations will be fully addressed, if not already, I will rise in support of the Bill."
- "There being no further discussion. Speaker Braun: and Representative Curran having already closed, the question is. 'Shall House Bill 2493 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final Representative Davis, your light is on. voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Curran? Representative Curran. vour lightage do you seek recognition at this time? Pardon? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 41 voting \*no\*. House Bill 2493, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Labor, Special Order of Labor, House Bills Second Reading, appeared House Bi 11 1034, Representative Saltsman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Sorry 1035 1035 "
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1035, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wages of Employees on Public Works Act. This Bill has been read a Second Time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Braun: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Regan."
- Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan, on Amendment #1."
- Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Amendment 1 addresses some confusion in the language of the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act. In the area of vacation pay, the confusion in the language has brought about lawsuits and this is to clarify that. If a person has a contract with an employer and the employer says you work here one year you get one week of vacation. if you work here two years you get two weeks of vacation. simply says that in order to get two full weeks of vacation. vou must work two full vears. ⊌hat has been happening in the past is, if a person leaves his employer after a year and a half, they would give them half of vacation pay that he didnot actually earn. I move for an 'ave' vote, please,"

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Amendment

1... or the adoption of Amendment 1. On that, the

Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."

Saltsman: "Was this Amendment already defeated in Committee as part of a Bill?"

Regan: "No. We've never voted on this. This is one of those things with the time mix-up and the delay, even though I gave my time to some of your side's people to come in front of me, it never reached the floor of the Committee for a vote."

Saltsman: "Yes. Madam Speaker, on the Amendment. alreadv ruled on this case and it ruled in favor of the emplovee. that he had previously worked for it was for previous time earned, and the vacation. and courts have already ruled on this and this is why this Amendment should be defeated and I encourage everyone on this side of the aisle to vote 'no'."

Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

close. Representative Regan."

- Regan: "I just think that it clarifies. It will cease any further lawsuits, and if there is an agreement by the employee and the employer that you work a certain length of time to deserve certain benefits. I think it's only a fair Bill and it will send a message that we certainly want to send to business that we're fair, and labor should consider it fair and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment

  1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the
  opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it, and the Amendment
  is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

- Speaker Braun: "Third... Representative Saltsman... Third On the Order of House 8ills. Reading. Special Order Convevances. appears House Ai 11 932. Representative Representative Richmond? Richmond. Out of the record. House Bill 2322, Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2322, a Bill for an Act to release easements and restore access rights to certain described lands in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Braun: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Braun: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Cook on Amendment l.

Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Floor Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment which

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- spells out some of the extra parcels of land that the Department... additional parcels of land that the Department wants to include in the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of Amendment \$1 to House Bill 2322. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it.

  Amendment \$1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 1781, Representative Van Duyne. Representative Van Duyne in the chamber? Representative Van Duyne? Representative Churchill. Is Representative Churchill in the Chamber? House Bill 2810.

  Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2810, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the power of the Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The... Representative Churchill, the Gentleman from Lake."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At this time I would move to table Amendment #4."
- Speaker Giglio: "This Bill... The Gentleman asks leave to return
  House Bill 2810 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he
  have leave? Leave is granted. The Bill is now on Second
  Reading. Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Yes. Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Now I would move to table Amendment \$4."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #4 to

  House Bill 2810. Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted.

  Table Amendment... Amendment #4 is tabled. Further

  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Van Duyne. Are

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

you seeking recognition, Sir?"

- Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just outside the door talking to one of the Gentlemen and you went by 1781.

  Hould you please go back to it?"
- Speaker Giglio: "One moment, Sir. Representative Churchill, could you take this out of the record for a moment, Sir?

  Okay. Okay, on the Third... on that Order of Business we skipped over House Bill 1781. On page 33 of the Calendar, House Bill 1781, Representative Van Duyne, on Conveyances.

  The Gentleman from Hill, Representative Van Duyne. Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1781, a Bill for an Act directing the

  Department of Conservation to convey certain real property.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: ™The Gentleman from Hill, Representative Van
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker. It's a very simple Bill. It
  just allows the Department of Conservation to lease. The
  Bill has been amended from selling it to them for a dollar
  to leasing it to the Joliet Port Authority for one dollar
  for a long term lease, which will be figured out by the
  Department of Conservation. I move for passage of House
  Bill 1781."
- Speaker Giglio: "On that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago,

  Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hallock: "Was there an appraisal attached to this property?"

Van Duyne: "No, Representative Hallock. The property is not going to be conveyed to them. All they are going to do is lease it from them. So there is no... there is no assessment of the property necessary."

Hallock: "We're talking here, basically, about a very small

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

amount of property. It said 66 feet by 1000 feet?"

Van Duyne: "Right. And then there's another island alongside the waterway there that ... and all this land Truly. I question the Port Authority's interest abandoned. because it... all it does is mean more upkeep. this Heretofore, the Conservation Department has never It's all grown up in scrub trees and taken care of it. whatever, and they want to clean this land off so that people in the City of Joliet can use it on two special occasions, when they have their Waterway Days that have along the canal and just that, but there's nο assessment necessary in that there is no title transfer аt all."

Hallock: "Thank vou∘"

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Leverenz,"

Leverenz: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Could you explain to us how they are going to use the land?"

Van Duyne: "Yes, Representative, I just did to Representative Hallock. They are going to use it for people to go there and sit and drink pop or beer or ice cream cones and that kind of stuff when Joliet has it's Waterway Days and other functions that they have at the Bicentennial Park. In other words, they are going to use it for, like, a picnic area for our people."

Leverenz: "Is it then adjacent to other property that is currently being used for that kind of purpose?"

Van Duyne: "Beg your pardon?"

Leverenz: "Is it adjacent to other property that is being used for the same purpose?"

Van Duyne: "Yes. Yes, it's right contiguous to the Bicentennial

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

Park in Joliet."

Leverenz: "They're not going to put any permanent structures on it or anything of that nature?"

Van Duvne: "No."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will,

Representative Van Duvne, to close."

Van Duyne: "Very simply put, I ask everyones' support for this.

The Joliet Port Authority wants to clean up this land and make it suitable for picnicking, and doubly important, too, is the fact that the Conservation Department keeps it up not at all, so it's going to be a productive thing."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1781 pass?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1781, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman asks leave to hear House Bill 2810 return to Third Reading. Representative Churchill. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2810, on the Order of Third Reading, a

  Bill for an Act in relationship to the powers of the

  Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason that Amendment #4 was withdrawn was so that we could put this Bill back in the shape that it is just a shell Bill, and that is all it is at this point, is a shell Bill. We're working on an agreement for the Capitol Development Board which will eventually be placed

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

on this in the Senate, so I'd ask for a positive vote on this Bill."

- Speaker Giglio: "The guestion is, 'Shall House Bill 2810 pass?' those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed A 1 1 'nav'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question. there are 115 'no', none voting 'present'. voting 'ves'. none voting House Bill 2810, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Hav I remind the Body 2:00 are changing the votes for the Consent WP Calendar. So those of you that want to change your votes Consent Calendar at 2:00, you have another for the approximately 10 minutes to come to the Clerk's well Turn to the Order of Second Reading, Public Health, on page 20 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2682, Representative Pullen. Mr. Clerk, has the fiscal note been filed? Clerk, read the Bill as amended."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2682, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Hemophilia Advisory Committee. It has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 7 were adopted previously."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There's no Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Has the fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk Leone: "I have... The fiscal note has been filed on House
Bill 2682 as amended."

Speaker Giglio: "Fiscal note's been filed. No further

Amendments. Third Reading. Representative Homer for a

Motion. The Gentleman from Fulton."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rule 5(c) of this House requires

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

the Clerk to print each Bill and place it on the desk of the Members as soon as it's printed. He have before us now pending Senate Bill 1085, which is a revisory Bill, quite lengthly in nature. It's come over from the Senate, and I would, at this time, move to suspend Rule 5(c) so that it will be unnecessary for the Clerk to put the Bill on each Member's desk."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend House Rules 7(c), 5(c). The Gentleman from Hinnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Well, thank you, Ar. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Giglio: "A question of the Sponsor?"

Hallock: "A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Homer?"

Hallock: "In reviewing the digest, it clearly appears that it
amends numerous Chapters and it may, in fact, be a
technical Bill. Could you speak to the Bill itself and
tell us what it is and what it does?"

Homer: "It's the... it's the Annual Revisory Bills. It's 226

pages that have come from the Legislative Reference Bureau

that's... we call the Revisory Bill. I'm a Hember... I

was asked to do this because I'm a Member of the LRB

Committee. Representative Tuerk is the Chairman, and, of

course, he's incapacitated, so I was asked to make the

Amendment... make the Motion. But I can't tell you what it

does, no."

Hallock: "I think we'll probably join in that request. Could you hold it for a second, while we have a chance to just review the Bill."

Homer: "Sure. Sure. I understood it had been cleared through
Republican leadership earlier. I think Mr. O'Brien had
talked to us... your leaders and they approved the Motion,

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- but I would be happy to take it out of the record if you need time to verify that."
- Hallock: "Yes. I appreciate your intention to try to save the...

  save some trees from the fall of the ax, and some paper
  herein, but let us look at it first. Thank you."
- Homer: "Sure. Okay."
- Speaker Giglio: "Laid out on the Order of Business for today,
  2:00 we're going to Local School Districts at page 33...
  33, Second Reading, Local School District, House Bills on
  Second Reading, appears House Bill 1177, Representative
  Huff. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1177, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
  to revise the Public School System in the City of Chicago.

  Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee

  Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by

  Representatives McAuliffe and McCracken."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative McAuliffe on Amendment #1."
- McAuliffe: "I defer to Representative Kirkland on that

  Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kirkland on Amendment #1 to House
  Bill 7... 1177.
- Kirkland: "Yes, I'll handle the Amendment. Amendment &1 amends
  the School Code and the Election Code. Creates 20 school
  districts in Chicago and abolishes the School Finance
  Authority. Vests all taxing, bonding and budgetary power
  to the... in the City Council."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I rise in opposition to Amendment #1 to House Bill 1177

  primarily because, as I perceive it, it is somewhat hostile

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

and also somewhat capricious to the intent of the Bill.

House Bill 1177 seeks only to create three local school districts on a pilot basis. This Amendment would decentralize the whole school system in a.o. as I stated, in a capricious way that would have a devastating and pernicious effect. While the Bill. the Amendment may be germane to the Bill, it is not germane to the intent of the Bill; and therefore, I would ask that it be defeated.

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Hembers of the House. in support of the Amendment. Clearly, all of us in the General Assembly want to have the best schools in the State, and I think most of us try to resolve those issues on a local basis. Unfortunately, because of the finance situation in the Chicago School District, we have to deal with that one here as well. The Chicago School unfortunatelv. has many, many problems and we're called on time and time again each Session to try to help address those issues. Things aren't working there too well, and I believe that this Amendment, offered bv Representative McAuliffe, would make great strides in trying to improve that system and I urge this be... I it be adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young,"

Young: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Young: "Does this Bill have any effect on the Chicago Board of Education?"

McAuliffe: "Hell, sure it has an effect on the Chicago Board of Education."

Young: "Well, what does it do to them, to the Board?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

McAuliffe: "It creates 20 school districts. Separate school districts."

Young: "Okay. And how will those school districts relate to the Board of Education, or will they?"

McAuliffe: "How would they relate to the Board of Education?"

Young: "Yes."

McAuliffe: "Hell. I hope they related well to them."

Young: "Will there be a board of education if this Amendment was adopted and passed?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Young: "And what would the makeup of that Board be? How would the Board be made up? Would it be elected? Hould it be appointed? Would it be the same Board that exists now?"

McAuliffe: "Each of the 20 districts would have their own elected

Young: "And how many... how large would those boards be?"

McAuliffe: "The overall board would remain the way it is now,
appointed by the Mayor of Chicago, with the advice and
consent of the City Council."

Young: "Okay. To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Our analyst tells me that this Amendment, first of all, would terminate the existence of the Chicago Board of Education. It would create over 20 separate school districts with individually elected boards. Some of us recognize the problem with the school system. Representative Huff has an Amendment follow that would be a small change in the structure and would not be such a drastic change as t a 20 separate school districts in Chicago. I don't think this Amendment was drafted with the consent the οf Sponsor of the Bill. It certainly isnot what the Chicago Board of Education wants, and I urge it's defeat."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion. The Gentleman from Cook.

Representative Bowman."

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

"Thank you. One question of the Sponsor, if you please?" Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Representative McAuliffe, can we assume that if Chicago is broken up into 20 separate school districts, that each will be entitled to a distribution or share of the resource equalizer formula allocation?"

McAuliffe: "It would go to the main board. the to Board Education."

Bowman: "Wait a minute. I thought you were dispensing with that. You're setting up school boards under the main school board."

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio:

Braun: "Thank

Bowman: "So who has the final authority? The main School Roard or the district school boards."

McAuliffe: "The main appointed Board would have the authority to distribute funds to the elected school boards in the 20 districts."

to the Bill... or to the Amendment, then, Mr. Bowman: "Well. It seems to me that the Gentleman has got himself into a kind of a Catch 22 situation here, and the proposal that he is making to us is creating a situation where you have all the money going to the main School Board. The main School Board will continue to allocate it as usual. Meanwhile, these local district boards are going sitting around twiddling their thumbs having nothing real or substantive to do because the purse strings are being So it seems to me that, you controlled from downtown. know, if you like creating bureaucracy for bureaucracy's fine, go ahead and vote for the Amendment. Otherwise, I think a 'no' vote is recommended on this one."

Representative Braun." Speaker.

The

Just

Lady

to

from

uр

pick

"Further discussion?

Mr.

you,

Cook,

where

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Representative Bowman has left off. We've been fighting for years to have the dollars follow the child in the schools with regard to the distribution o f formula allocation monies, and this Amendment would just turn the clock back, and instead of having the dollars follow the the dollars would follow first: the first bureaucracy and then the second bureaucracy. finally. I guess, eventually, after it's trickled down, if any is left for the children. and for education. then maybe, possibly, they will get to see some benefit from it. I think this is a bad Amendment and I urge its defeat.

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

  McAuliffe, to close."
- McAuliffe: "One of the Gentlemen talked about a drastic change.

  I think the Chicago Board of Education could use a drastic change. And I think that almost any change in the Chicago Board of Education would have to be a change for the better. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House

  Bill 1177 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those
  opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who
  wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

  Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 55
  voting 'yes', 58 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The
  Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Huff."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Huff on Amendment #2."
- Huff: "Withdraw Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Hithdraw Amendment #2. Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Huff."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #3, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 simply adds subdistrict 9
as a semiautonomous school district and makes clarification
in the language with reference to syndication, which is a
innovative approach for revenue producing without taxing.

I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 2719, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2719, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to establish an elected Board of Education for school districts. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Sentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a fiscal note filed on
that Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Are you referring to 2719, Representative Huff?"

Huff: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "There is a fiscal note filed, Sir."

Huff: "There is?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes. Did you... did you want to hear your Bill on Third Reading?"

Huff: "No."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. The time now for changing your vote on the Consent Calendar is now near, and it will be closed. Anybody else would want to change their position on some of

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the Bills that are on the Consent Calendar, please come forward. If not, it will be closed. Hearing none, seeing none, the Clerk will no longer accept any change of votes on the Consent Calendar. Representative Brunsvold?

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the House to move House Bill 911 to Second Legislative Day for the purpose... excuse me, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. I have an Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to move House Bill 911
  to Second Legislative Day. Does the Gentleman have leave?
  Leave is granted. The Bill now is on Second Reading.

  Second Legislative Day. Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "I believe there is an Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "House Bill 911. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 34 of your Calendar, House Bill 911, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to emergency telephone systems. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Brunsvold."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brunsvold on Amendment #2 to House Bill 911."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment \$2 would erase all provisions of the Bill and make it a shell Bill with some wording about a study being done this summer, discussions with the phone company, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment \$2."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 911. And on that question, the Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Frederick: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill is exactly as the Sponsor said. It satisfies, now, all the parties, and I would urge adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "No, that's alright."
- Speaker Giglio: "He're out of the record. Further discussion?

  Mr. Brunsvold?"
- Brunsvold: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 911. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment \$2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to... leave of the House to suspend 37(d), and for immediate consideration of House Bill 911."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is on Third

  Reading. We'll just hold it there."
- Speaker Giglio: "That's correct. The Bill will remain on Third Reading."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hallock. Are you seeking recognition. Sir?"
- Hallock: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice and quiet here, but we have a lot to do yet, probably 600 Bills left on the Calendar. Can you tell us where we're going to go next, and when we're going to go to that Order."
- Speaker Giglio: "We're moving right along, Representative

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

We're going through the Calendar right now. Hallock. Alright, the Chair now will go to the Order of Call on Children, and Children is broken down into divisions: Children Development two and Children Protection. He will now go to Child Development. And on that appears House Bill 294, Representative Currie. On page 17 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 294,... that's page 18 of the Calendar.

House Bill 294, a Bill for an Act in relationship to

medical care for low-income pregnant women and newborn
infants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie,"

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. House Bill 294 is an effort to help stem the appalling infant mortality statistics that plague the State of Illinois. The Bill would require the Department of Public Health to establish and operate a prenatal and newborn care program to help cover cost of medical services to pregnant babies when those women have incomes below the poverty level. In effect, this Bill would make sure Parents Too Soon and other infant mortality reduction initiatives reach all the women in the state who are in need of those services. I would be happy to answer your questions and I would appreciate your support for this Bill that, I think, can do a good deal to improve the health and the opportunity of our youngsters to thrive and to grow the State of Illinois."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 294 pass?"

And on that... on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the

Sponsor yield for a question? As I review this, it appears

to be another one of those programs which the State might

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

want to consider initiating at some point in time, but it also appears to have a tremendous cost impact. Could you speak to that issue, please?"

- Currie: "Well, Representative, let me tell you first that the Department of Public Health began by opposing this 3ill on the grounds that they already do it. Нe have evidence suggesting they don't already do it across the State. Not everybody is entitled to these services. The fiscal the Department offers is under \$80,000.00 a vear. under 80.000.00. T don't think this is the kind of expenditure that we can cheerfully say is too much. think less than \$80,000.00 for babies that are born birth weights, that mean they are not likely subjects of developmental disabilities, expensive hospitalizations. mothers who get prenatal care, and therefore are more likely to produce babies that survive the first life, and when they do survive, have an opportunity to thrive. The costs we presently pay for babies that developmental disabilities, high birth risk of weight babies, the costs we now pay for babies born at risk of infant death are enormous costs. and our statistics, in respect to both low birth weight babies and infant mortality, are among the worst in the nation. think we can't afford not to spend less than \$80,000.00 in see to it that these young, low-income women and their babies have a chance."
- Hallock: "Thank you for that explanation. I guess my question is directed more to the fact that I'm kind of puzzled as to what more this will do, because I'm aware that many hospitals in the State, in order to redress the problem which you have spoken to, and that is a need for great care in those early stages. The need for some good perinatal programs, do this now. So the nature of my question

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

really was, what more is this going to do than what's being done right now, because my impression is, and I think my understanding, this is done now in most hospitals throughout the state, or at least in most cities throughout the State they will have at least one hospital which will conduct this sort of activity at the present time. So how does this expand that?"

- all. Representative, it means that some women Currie: "First of who right now do not find those services available in their communities will have some place to look for them. Secondly, the services in this Bill are not hospital In fact, when we wait until the low-income services alone. pregnant woman, a teenager in particular, when we wait for her to find medical service at the moment of birth, without prenatal care, without adequate nutritional information and guidance, without the kind of diet that will make it likely is born well and strong, that's when we're in This Bill doesn't say you get the care when turn UD at the emergency room. This Bill says that the Department of Public Health has a responsibility to help you during the course of that pregnancy and to help the baby after birth."
- Hallock: "Hell. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Tο the Bill itself. It's my understanding that the currently does this now in just about every way. shape or form it can be undertaken. Also, I would say that most hospitals around this State work with the State of Illinois to insure that all parents in this category receive the maximum of protection and coverage that they may choose to pursue. I think the problem may be in some situations that, although this is available, many parents don't choose to undertake the time to really find out exactly what can be done to help them throughout all their situations with

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

pregnancies. I would say to you that anything beyond what's being done right now probably is not cost effective, because this is being done right now. I think this Bill is unnecessary and I urge a 'no' note."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook. Representative Woicik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I too rise in opposition and I can also echo the thoughts of the previous speaker. I would like to point out that this truly is in the 1988 budget for the Public Health. It's already being done in some parts of the State. Next year it will be done throughout the whole state. The Bill is entirely unnecessary and there really is no need for it."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Preston."

vou. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Preston: "Thank House. I rise in support of this Bill. Not only is the Bill necessary, but the program that would come into effect it passes and becomes law, is the most cost effective thing we can do here in Illinois. Money that... amount of money that is today spent on prenatal health care and early childhood infant care is recouped by the decrease in funds that would be necessary to take care of a low-weight baby, a baby that is ill, children that are ill, end up statistically being far more likely to be abused children. abused children perform poorly school. Children who perform poorly in school end and much of that can be related iustice system. back to the lack of prenatal and early infant care that child has. By investing small dollars, we immediately save large dollars to the State of Illinois that might be necessary to care for a child that ends up being i 1 1 child and requiring far more dollars to care for that child than a few pennies spent in the necessary prenatal and

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- early infant care. So this is a very cost efficient Bill and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Slater."
- Slater: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"
- Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."
- Slater: "Representative Currie, you've indicated that this is going to cost \$80,000.00, according to the fiscal note. I hear conversation around the floor that this is not a necessary piece of legislation. Just in a clear and concise manner, tell us for \$80,000.00 what we're going to be able to get if this legislation passes."
- Currie: "I'm sorry. What was the question?"
- Slater: "What will we get for the \$80,000.00 if this legislation passes?"
- "What we get is the opportunity to make sure that all the Currie: the State, who are under the age of 21 and are low-income and are pregnant, have access to these important prenatal. medical, dietary services, and so do The Department of Public Health, in its fiscal babies. note, for less than \$80,000.00 describes about \$65,000.00 of those... of the total in terms of well child nurse visits. That is, we get for that money the opportunity for these infants to be visited at least twice during their six months. That's an important thing to have in a state where we suffer from appalling low birth weight, statistics and also substantial infant mortality statistics. A state which, for the first time in many vears. has seen an increase in infant mortality. Never mind some very excellent programs that we have begun the last several years."
- Slater: "So would it be fair to say, that for all practical

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

purposes we are utilizing machinery that's already in place? We are utilizing personnel already in place?

- Currie: "We are expanding on existing programs to make sure that
  the program reaches across the geography of the State of
  Illinois, not only individuals who happen to live in
  certain census tracts or certain community neighborhoods."
- Slater: "One final question. Why do we need this if we have all these programs already in place. Representative Currie?"
- Currie: "Because the programs presently do not reach all who can benefit from the services, and because we do not, in the programs we have in place, make sure that we are looking at the well baby care along with the prenatal and nutritional guidance care that this Bill proposes."

Slater: "My thanks to the Sponsor."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hould the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

- Ropp: "Representative Currie, you mentioned that this Bill should, in fact, take care of all people who are obviously, according to your interpretation, falling through the cracks. Is this... is this the final Bill in a legislative process that will finally take care of everybody on a particular issue?"
- Currie: "Representative, this Bill applies to low-income, pregnant women under the age of 21 and their new babies."
- Ropp: "Well, is it not true that in school, now, high school, for example, that we teach home ec.? Aren't these same programs now being made available to those young ladies who would be attending school?"
- Currie: "Of course, many of these young women are not in school,

  Representative Ropp, and we're dealing here with medical

  and health services, nutritional guidance and so forth, as

  well as prenatal visits, and as well as visits from the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

nurse to new babies in their home settings. They don't do that at  ${\it school}$ .

Ropp: "Hell, are you saying that if, when we went to school, when we were 16, 17 and 18 and learned these things, that we don't remember them, then, when we're 21, or under 21?"

Currie: "This is a service program, Representative, not an educational program. I mean, I believe service also implies some educational experience, but this is a direct service program."

"Well, I would think that in every county in the State Ropp: o f Illinois, we have extension services that provide these kinds of either services or educational programs for ladies who are about to become mothers, and that these programs should certainly be utilized. Thev ďο not be it either age or sex or color or prohibit anvone. religion from the services, and that I would certainly encourage those people who obviously, for some reason, feel that they are not made available to those services, utilize current services that we have here in the State of Illinois. One final question. In our analysis it says 'persons eligible for assistance are' and then it says \*whose gross income does not exceed the nonfarm poverty Can you tell me what the nonfarm poverty income income. guideline is?"

Currie: "I believe, Representative, it's \$5,500.00 on a yearly basis for one person."

Ropp: "For one person. Okay."

Currie: "So this is targeted to low income people."

Ropp: "Alright, I guess to the Bill, very briefly. Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems like this is another Bill that is attempting to work in areas that we already have a number of programs in existence, and I somewhat generally support these programs, if in fact we can spend a few bucks now, so

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

that we don't have to spend more dollars later on. Beina in the legislature now for several years, I don\*t I've ever seen a program that has started that has had any major impact on a program later on in life. Every program that we've started, in the next 4 or 5 years, has continued to increase in total dollars. And so all these programs that we're attempting to help young people early in some reason, it seems like we just spend more and more money. and I think in this particular session. when we're a little bit short of funds, I would hope that these would people utilize existing programs that are on line, that are working and that have shown proven results before."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House
Bill 294 is intended precisely to make sure that services
are available to low income pregnant women and their
newborn babies, when those women are under the age of 21.
Pregnant women who do not receive prenatal care are three
times as likely to deliver a low birth weight baby than
women who do receive prenatal care. Those babies are 20
times more likely to die before their first baby, because
they have serious developmental and learning disabilities.
The cost for hospitalization for a premature or low birth
weight baby is likely to exceed \$20,000.00. House Bill
294..."

Speaker Giglio: "Continue."

Currie: " ...from the Department of Public Health would cost us
less than \$80,000.00 to operate. I think this is money
well spent. Four babies born without deficiencies and
disabilities, is all that we'll need to save in order to
pay for this program. I would urge your 'yes' vote for
House Bill 294."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 294 pass?'

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ar. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 63 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. Representative... and 3 voting 'present'. Representative Hulcahey, 'aye'. 64,
- Wojcik: "Yes, since this Bill has passed, I would like to have a Verified Roll Call, a verification."
- Speaker Giglio: "Verification. Representative Parke?"
- Parke: "Mr. Chair, I'd like to be recorded as 'present'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke votes 'present'.

  Representative Hoffman votes 'no'. Are there further changes? Now there are 65 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present', and the Lady asks for a verification.

  Representative Currie asks for a poll of the absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "A poll of those not voting. Representative Farley,

  Giglio, Keane, Kulas and Hautino."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giglio votes "aye", Mr. Clerk.

  The Lady asks for a verification. Mr. Clerk, verify the affirmative."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios, Bouman, Braun,
  Breslin, Brunsvold, Bugielski, Christensen, Cullerton,
  Curran, Currie, Daley, Davis, DeJaegher, ..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, can I have leave to be verified now?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave, Representative Wojcik? The Gentleman has leave,"
- Mulcahey: "Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Leave is granted. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative.

  DeJaegher, DeLeo, Deuchler, Dunn, Flinn..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hojcik. Representative Preston and Representative Keane ask leave to be verified and Representative Keane wishes to vote 'aye'. Record Representative Keane as voting 'aye'. Representative Leflore asks leave to be verified."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative.

  Flinn, Flowers, Giglio, Giorgi, Granberg, Greiman, Hannig,

  Hartke, Hicks, Homer, Huff, Hultgren, Jones...."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Jones asks leave to be verified, Representative Hojcik. Does the Lady have leave? Yes, the Lady has leave."
- Clerk Leone: "Keane, Kirkland, Krska, Laurino, LeFlore, Leverenz,
  Levin, Martinez, Matijevich,..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Mautino votes "aye",
  Representative Ronan? The Gentleman asks leave to be
  verified, Representative Hojcik. You have leave, Sir.
  Representative Levin asks for leave to be verified,
  Representative Hojcik. Representative Levin asks leave to
  be verified. You have leave, Sir. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing. Mautino, McNamara, McPike, Morrow, Mulcahey, Novak, O'Connell, Panayotovich, Phelps, Preston, Rea, Rice, Richmond, Ronan, Saltsman, Satterthwaite, Shaw, Slater, Steczo, Stern, Sutker, Turner, Van Duyne, White, Williams, Wolf, Anthony Young, Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the affirmative.

  Representative Hojcik?"

Wojcik: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Wojcik: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn? Monroe Flinn, is the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Wojcik: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond? Bruce Richmond. Is the Gentleman in the chamber. He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Wojcik: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw is in the chamber."

Wojcik: "Okay. Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Panayotovich is in the chamber."

Woicik: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Representative Bruce Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not.

Remove him from the Roll Call."

Woicik: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative. Has Representative · Farley voting, Hr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman was not voting."

Wojcik: "Excuse me. Representative McGann."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann is in his chair, as always."

Wojcik: "They got him hidden over there. I can't see him.

Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell. John O'Connell. Is

the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from
the Roll Call."

Wojcik: "Representative Bugielski."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bugielski? Bob Bugielski, is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Wojcik: "Representative Berrios."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Berrios is in the chamber."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Wojcik: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio. Frank Giglio is in the chamber."

Wojcik: "Get in your seat, Frank. Representative Phelps."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps is in his chair."

Wojcik: "Representative Greiman?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman? Representative Alan Greiman? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not.

Remove him from the Roll Call."

Wojcik: "Representative Matijevich?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Wojcik: "Representative Matijevich?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich is in the chamber.

Representative Bob Bugielski is in the chamber. Add him to
the Roll Call voting "ave"."

Wojcik: "Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Jim DeLeo? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call. Do you have any further questions of the Affirmative?"

Wojcik: "Representative... oh, she asked, Jones asked for leave, correct? Representative Jones?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, she did."

Woicik: "No further questions."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 44

voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

passed. House Bill 295, Representative Currie. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 295, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie.

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

Currie: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, and Members This Bill would enable Illinois to take advantage of recent expansions in the Federal Medicaid Program. Legislation passed by the Federal Congress and signed hv President in response to infant mortality and low birth weight problems across this country. has determined the Federal Government will help us Dav for medical services to all low income pregnant women and their newborn their incomes reach children when the Federal level. That standard is more expansive that the present Illinois standard. The reason the Federal Government and these United States. the President of Ronald Reagan. decided this was a good idea is because it is clear in this country that we must do something to stem the infant mortality statistics that we suffer from from one state to the next. Illinois is no exception to the general In fact, we are among the ten bottom states mortality. For black babies, we are among the five worst states in the nation. House Bill 295 will enable to serve with prenatal and birth services low income women of whose babies are otherwise at risk developmental disabilities and in some cases, even death. It will also enable us to take advantage of federal dollars. in the State of Illinois about our balance of payment problem with Hashington. He send more to Washington we get back. Every dollar we spend under the provisions of 295 is matched, one for one, by the Federal Bi 11 House Bill 295 offers us the opportunity to Government. a pressing social and physical problem. It also offers us the opportunity to access federal dollars are available for this worthwhile purpose. I would welcome and I would certainly appreciate your vour questions, support for House Bill 295."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the passage of House Bill 295. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question... the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken. The Lady from Cook, Representative Woicik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. My light was on. I do have some questions of the Sponsor. Do you know approximately what this would cost per woman?"

Speaker Breslin: "Turn on Representative Currie's light, please?" Currie: "There is some confusion as to the actual cost. can stadium. tell you, a lot less than a football The Department of Public Aid has given me three separate figures on the cost of this program, ranging from 4.8 million total, which would be 2.4 million state, Economic and Fiscal Commission casts grave doubt upon the most recent fiscal note from the Department Public Aid. It is clear, from the Economic and Fiscal analysis, that the program can be nothing like as expensive as the \$20,000,000.00 most recent price tag that Department gave me. The people who work in this area tell me that on basis of their figures, there is no question that the State cost would not exceed 5 million dollars. Not only than a football stadium, this Bill is a lot less than a baseball stadium•"

Wojcik: "I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Wojcik: "According to what I see, we are looking at a cost of \$2,368.00 per woman, and that would total 30 million dollars annually. The cost of providing the care for the infants and children up to age 2 under this Act, which covers approximately 15,900, is estimated at an additional 13.6 million annually. What we really are looking at with the cost of this Bill is 44.4 million dollars. Though the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Sponsor is well intended, I think that with the current crises developing within this State, we're going to have to seriously look at some of these proposals, and I am saying that this would be very drastic at this time to pick up such a cost. We're talking 44.4 million dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Hill, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Hembers of the House. Will the

Sponsor leave for some questions, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Regan: "Representative Currie, what's the difference between this

Bill and the last Bill, just briefly, if you could?"

Currie: "The last Bill did not deal with birthing services, but prenatal care for low income pregnant women up to the age of 21. This Bill would take advantage of President Reagan's program so that we could cover birthing and prenatal services for all low income pregnant women."

Regan: "Doesn't that sound repetitive? Isn't that... "

Currie: "Well, it would expand beyond the age of 21 and it would include delivery services."

Regan: "Oh, this is for over 21."

Currie: "It will include the people that were covered under the last Bill, but extend the coverage to those over the age of 21, if they are low income. That's the Bill the President signed, and this Bill only would make sure that our Governor can get some of our taxpayer dollars back from Washington, just the way President Reagan wants us to, because he cares, as we do, about solving this problem of infant mortality and infant morbidity."

Regan: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This goes on and on forever. \$83,000.00 sounded pretty cheap for under 21. Over 21 is 44 million. That speaks well for the 17 year-olds and 16 year-olds. Looks like they're doing a pretty good job. We've talked a lot about cradle

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

to grave. This certainly brings it womb to tomb, and I would say for a 'no' vote there."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As with the previous Bill, this Bill is a very needed and cost effective measure. This permits federal participation. federal dollars. in a program that would make future spending by the State unnecessary because we intervene at a prenatal or very early age of the child to keep a child well so that that child need not eat \$20,000.00 as an underweight, sickly newborn baby. the cost. That's what happens as the alternative to this You're going to end up with underweight legislation. child... mothers who don't have prenatal care for their pregnancy will end up with underweight children. These underweight children will need hospitalization, hospitalization, as newborn babies, and that cost will be \$20,000.00 cost instead of much fewer dollars spent at early stage. Irving Harris, who testified before the Select Committee on Children, emphasized how very important this kind of legislation was, and how very cost effective this kind of legislation was, to avoid future costs and future problems in human terms. So I... I could not strongly urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you• Madam Speaker• I move the previous question•"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

  The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The question

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

is put. Representative Currie to close."

- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said initially, the cost question is not altogether clear. The Department of Public first said 2.4 million, a far cry from the 44 million you've heard described on this floor. There's no question that this Bill will cost state taxpayers well under 5 million dollars. The money will be well spent. responsibility to the unborn babies. The babies today. born with low birth weight, who are a problem for If we want to solve the problem of infant taxpavers. mortality, this is the way for us to go. Let's say Illinois is ready to see the you, President Reagan. problems your way and to rescue back some of the dollars we send to Washington. • Let's vote 'yes' for House Bill 295."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 295 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Representative Stephens, one minute to explain your vote."
- Stephens: "It won't take that long, Madam Speaker. Thank The constant invoking of President Reagan's name, i f Reagan, if President Reagan had the line item veto, like he quant to have. he would have seen fit to strike the language from the federal Bill allowing for this. It's a priorities. matter of ₩e can't dο everything for We have to ... what you're talking about is 44 million dollars in increased expenditures. No way to He're fooling the public. He ought not be voting for this foolishness."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

  McNamara. One minute to explain your vote."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's important to realize what this Bill actually does. It brings, and it actually reduces the cost of the hospitalization that the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Public Aid is going to have to carry on for those children that are very... that are undernourished, that are born... that have all of those problems, and it saves us the funds to carry those through life. This is a preventative program... What is the cost of life? I think it's a very fine program and I commend the Sponsor for bringing it to the floor."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken. One minute... Have all voted who wish? This Bill requires 60 votes for passage.

Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie, one minute to explain your vote."

Currie: "Again, cheaper than a football stadium. Cheaper than a softball stadium. and it's about what we're supposed to bе the State of Illinois, that is making for an about in economy, making for a society in which babies can grow babies can thrive. This is what we're supposed to be about, helping people who are not in a position to help themselves. We can save money in the long-run. He can recapture our tax dollars that now go to Hashington. it seems to me, is exactly what the work of this State should be, and I would appreciate seeing more 'yes' votes for House Bill 295."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, how am I recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "You're not recorded as voting."

Speaker Breslin: "I wish to be recorded as voting "aye", and please change the voting switches so that I can record my votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 51 voting "aye", 50 voting "no" and 10 voting "present". Representative Currie asks for postponed consideration. The Bill will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 389, Representative Cullerton.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House 8ill 389, a Bill for an Act in relationship to trauma centers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of Starting, I believe, in December of last fire department ambulances in Chicago, who had a child... who was taking a child to a hospital, if that child was a trauma victim, would drive past the closest hospital and take the child to one of five hospitals Cook County. They included Loyola University Medical Center, Cook County Hospital, Children's Memorial Hospital, and the University of Chicago. This was pursuant to an ordinance which the City of Chicago adopted. And the purpose of that ordinance was to establish which hospitals were best able to care for children who were the victims of pediatric... of trauma. It turns out that medical evidence such, that if you take a child who has been an accident victim to a... not the closest hospital, but the that's best able to prepare for, and is prepared to care for that child, that you will save many lives. So this ordinance went into effect, and as a matter of fact, the City of Chicago is planning on expanding this program to only trauma victims, but pediatric emergency care The definition of trauma was such cover all types of accident cases. So these five hospitals voluntarily signed up. They are the hospitals And I took a tour of the Wyler are best prepared. Childrens' Hospital at the University of Chicago, and this girl, the La Rocca girl who had the four liver transplants, happened to be there. It's incredibly expensive equipment that is used for these little children. They have intensive care unit there that is just the highest cost

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

system in the whole hospital, because that's what they need to do to take care of these children. Now, the problem is that our I Care program, which we enacted, which I think is excellent program. which has. according the Department of Public Aid, saved over hundred million dollars this year by forcing hospitals to bе more competitive, and that system reimburses hospitals. Īη the beginning of the year they determine how many days, of Medicaid days, they will be given and how much their And it's a competitive process hospitals are being forced to have some cost control imposed upon them. The problem is, however, with that programs as it relates to pediatric specialized care, is that, when you pass an ordinance like this, there is really no competitiveness involved. The fire ambulance takes that one of those five hospitals. The payments, the Medicaid payment system, which reimburses the hospital, reimburses them up to about one-third to one-half of the actual cost to the hospital. As а result. these hospitals are threatened with dropping out of this particular program. And this, by the way, is a program which will be... should be set up statewide, and perhaps, someday will be set up statewide, just as we have with trauma centers, just as all hospitals in the state are You save lives if you bring a victim to the rated. proper what this Bill does is to hospital. So require the Department to negotiate separate contracts with these provide this specialty service. trauma centers that In doing so, they cannot limit the number of days to and the rates must be sufficient to reimburse the hospitals for services provided. And we would set up the Child Trauma and Critical Care Fund from which the payments would be made. Now, the Department, of course, is opposed

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

and I think the main reason why they are opposed to this. it is because of the precedent that it would set. The precedent would be, of course, that there is a whittling away of the theory of the I-Care program. I don't agree with that assessment. I'm not saying we should attack the I-Care program. I think it definitely saved the State a of money, and it's forced hospitals to be competitive, but when you get into this specific type of specialized care for children, those same factors aren't present. Sn for that reason, I think it's a good idea. Now, the way we would do this, then, is to set up a separate fund, the Child Trauma and Critical Care Fund, from which these payments would be made. They would be separate payments to these particular hospitals that would sign up for this If we don't have the money to appropriate into program. that fund, obviously no money can be spent. suggest to you that the issue as to whether or not we're going to spend more money on this program hospitals so that they will continue to provide specialized care, is something that we should decide we decide the appropriation process, but recognizing the fact that it is necessary to set up such a fund is DOW. this Bill will do. So the Department would say that. what ideally, if this was to be funded, it would be funded 5 million dollars. That's five million dollars that we would not be saving. Right now we're saving million. perhaps we'd save around a hundred million. So I think the issue of cost is something that should be taken up if and when we determine at the end of this year, this fiscal year, whether or not we're going to have any more money to spend. But setting up the program and establishing the fund and recognizing the problems that these hospitals have is what this Bill is all about. Of

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

bу Illinois it's supported the Hospital Association, because they recognize the fact that in these particular types of hospitals there is a need. This really is an issue that deals with health care and I would appreciate your support. Ве happy tο answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of

House Bill 389. And on that question, the Gentleman from

Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hill the Gentleman yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Ryder: "Representative, I think that you were fairly descriptive in your explanation of this matter; however, there was part of it that I didn't hear all that clearly. Perhaps you could restate it again. What's the cost or the fiscal note, fiscal impact of this legislation?"

Cullerton: "Well, what I said was this. We're establishing with this Bill, a separate fund, and that would have to be... money would have to be appropriated into that fund. When the money is appropriated into that fund, it would be paid out separately to the hospitals that are applying to this pediatric program. So this Bill doesn't cost a dime. The Department says that, in order to hospitals the way the Bill calls for, it would cost about 5 million dollars. That's what they anticipate So what that means is, instead of saving would be. 105 million dollars, as the Department is claiming this Care\* program will save this year, we\*11 only save a hundred million dollars."

Ryder: "Thank you for the answer to some other questions. The question that I asked was, the fiscal note on this matter does indicate a cost of 5 to 10 million dollars, is that

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

not correct?"

- Cullerton: "The fiscal note was prepared by the Department that's opposed to the Bill. I said it costs 5 million dollars if we decide to fund it."
- Ryder: "Fine. And, your Bill allows up to 200% of cost. Is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "No. Payments cannot exceed actual hospital cost.

  That 200% is 200% of the hospital's rate for basic care established by the Department, but in no way could it exceed their actual cost. The cost for pediatric care is so enormous that that's why that 200% was put in there.

  It's usually going to be more."
- Ryder: "If I understand correctly, these are the hospitals that negotiated with the Department of Public Aid, that now have a rate set, days established, by the Department of Public Aid, and we're talking about Public Aid recipients, and you are now saying that instead of going to the hospitals that bargained in good faith with the Department, and the Department that bargained in good faith with the hospitals, that we're opening up an entire process so that that bargaining was now not in good faith."
- Cullerton: "Very good point, and I'll try to explain it. When
  they negotiated with the Department, they established a
  rate that applies to all general hospital costs."

Ryder: "No. No, that's not right."

Cullerton: "When they negotiated with the Department, if you want to call it negotiate with the Department, they get one rate for Medicare patients. Okay, so the City of Chicago passes an Ordinance which says, if you are one of the five hospitals that are specialized in child care, and you want to sign up for this... volunteer for this program, we're going to bring you more kids. So these kids come in... are brought in. They by... they drive past the local community

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

hospital, and they show up at Childrens Memorial with these extra children who normally wouldn't be brought there. When they get there they have an additional number Medicaid patients who they normally would not have when they sat down and negotiated with the Department. of this ordinance, because of their volunteering to be... to have their specialized care utilized, they're having more children brought to them, so any negotiations that involved the number of days. or a rate. doesn't mean anvthing. because... now because of this ordinance they have to... have to take more children. Now the only option they have is to drop out of the program. These children then will be brought to the local hospital and many lives could be lost because they wouldn't get the specialized care that is necessary."

- Ryder: "Representative, surely you're not asking us to, in some way, inviolate an Ordinance of the City of Chicago to correct a problem that is created by an Ordinance of the City of Chicago. Surely, you're not asking us to do that."
- Cullerton: "No. No. Once again... once again, this is not...

  this does not apply just to Chicago. This applies to..."
- Ryder: "No, it applies to all states, but you're talking about an

  Ordinance by the City of Chicago that created this

  problem."
- Cullerton: "That's right. Well, when these hospitals..."
- Ryder: "Now you're asking us... and now you're asking us to change the whole thing?"
- Cullerton: "No. No. These hospitals... these hospitals are not mandated to be in this program. These hospitals are not mandated. When you have... when you have an accident out in Naperville, where there is a child who is a victim, and it's the best hospital... the best hospital to take care of that child is going to be, say, Loyola Medical Center, they

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

take that child in a helicopter to Loyola Medical Center. there's going to be treatment given to that child at Lovola's Medical Center. This is а statewide issue. in the state, if they want to establish These... anvwhere such a plan, if the State Department of Public Health, themselves, might establish such a ... "

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, your five minutes are up.

  Please bring your remarks to a close."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to finish.

  Ladies and Gentlemen, the point is that I-Care, through the

  Department of Public Aid, has saved us an estimated 100

  million dollars, and this Bill is the first step towards

  going back, by the Sponsor's own admission, we're going to

  lose 5% of that savings, and next year maybe more. This is

  the first step back. I-Care program works, it works well,

  and a 'no' vote is the proper vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative

  DeJaegher.
- DeJaegher: "Representative Cullerton. Clarification, and possibly I missed part of the conversation, but the gist that I get is, is it true that you're trying to negotiate a separate contract for those five hospitals in Chicago, or is this statewide?"
- Cullerton: "No. It's statewide. These hospitals are not all They are in the Chicagoland area. They happen to be the hospitals that specialize in child care, have a hospital in your area that has specialized... a special unit for child care, what we're saving with this you'd bring the children who are injured, not to the closest hospital, but to that hospital that has specialized services. And all the Bill says is that when Department negotiates with those hospitals determining how much money they are going to give them for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the Medicaid patients, they have to take that money out of a separate fund, and not penalize that hospital for accepting these children because they have these specialized services, expensive specialized services. So, to answer your question succinctly, it is a statewide program. Any hospital that provides specialized care would be eligible to get funded from this fund."

Dejaegher: "Then it's not your intent to set up a separate line item dealing with those specific five hospitals."

Cullerton: "Oh, no, not at all. It would be a separate fund, and again, I would point out, these hospitals are world famous, in some cases. The Children's Memorial Hospital is world famous. They have people coming in from all over the State, all over the Nation, are brought in to these hospitals. And the same thing would be true. Someone who is injured in your district could be brought in, and in fact, probably right now, is brought in for specialized care in one of these hospitals."

DeJaegher: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: ™The Gentleman from Lake, Representative
Churchill.□

Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Churchill: "Representative Cullerton, am I to hear you correctly saying there is a special ordinance in the City of Chicago that makes it so that children from the City of Chicago go to these hospitals that are under the contract?"

Cullerton: "I'm trying to think of the best way to answer that.

The best way would be to set up... give you an analogy."

Churchill: "No. Is there an ordinance?"

Cullerton: "Yes. There is an ordinance."

Churchill: "And the ordinance says that these children shall go to these facilities."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Cullerton: "If the facilities volunteer to be part of the program."

Churchill: "Okay, so if they are a part of the program that get public aid dollars, then the children go to those facilities, and that's in a specific ordinance in the City of Chicago."

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Churchill: "Okay. And how many hospitals are there that are under this contract?"

Cullerton: "Pardon me?"

Churchill: "How many hospitals does this include?"

Cullerton: "Right now, it includes five. They're located... I'll give you the names."

Churchill: "No. That's okay. I... there are five... "

Cullerton: "They're not in Chicago... not all in Chicago, you understand that?"

Churchill: "Okay, where are they?"

Cullerton: "And they don't accept children all from Chicago, you understand that?"

Churchill: "I understand, but it is a Chicago ordinance that says that."

Cullerton: "They come from Lake County, they come from DuPage County, they come from anywhere across the state. they have this specialized care. You see, the best way to explain this to you, assuming you're sincere in your question, is that we... looking at the trauma network that we have now, the Illinois Department of Public Health a trauma network. I think they rate hospitals in three categories, in terms of their ability to deal with trauma victims, and as a result, people are directed to the hospitals which are best able to handle trauma victims. The same thing will happen with pediatric trauma. In Chicago they did it already through this ordinance. The

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

same thing will be done throughout the Department... throughout the State by the Department, and as a result, you will have this network where specific hospitals that can handle this particular type of emergency, will be the ones where they will be directed. When that happens, when they get these extra kids, the I-Care program doesn't... the principles of the I-Care program don't apply. theory of the I-Care program is to bring people to local community based hospitals rather than more expensive teaching hospitals. But that theory doesn't work when you're talking about specialized care."

- Churchill: "Okay, but can't they go back to the contract process and negotiate for specialty care, for more days for specialty care?"
- Cullerton: "I don't want to misstate what the Department says. think, to be fair, the Department says that they take into account the fact that these people could be getting more trauma victims, children trauma victims, and as that into account when they negotiate contracts. You see, you have to understand that the this really works, you think it's like a negotiation. way it really works is, they sit down and say we got X number of dollars, and therefore, you're going to get X number of days at a certain rate. It's about one-half of what their actual costs are to the hospitals. So it's good the fact that it forces the hospitals to cut down on but they're never their costs, going to reimbursed for their expenses for Medicaid patients. And is what... this is what the hospitals have been complaining about the program, but, you know, it's good and it's bad, but with regard to these specialized... with regard to the things that are needed to take care of kids, there's just no way they could possibly come close to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

recouping the cost. So that's the theory of the Bill."

- Churchill: "Okay, to the Bill, Madam Speaker. I guess I would rise in opposition because I feel that this is a Bill that, because of a Chicago ordinance, we are going to have to create a drain on the system for the total state and that everybody else in the whole state is going to end up transporting dollars to this particular program because of an ordinance that they have in only the City of Chicago. So I would stand in opposition."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

  Terzich. Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Let me go. Thank you. Representative Cullerton. vou mentioned about the fire department ambulances going to trauma centers, and you stipulated that they... thev have roughly five trauma centers where the ambulance goes to, and they have that set up because the hospitals have qualified to administer certain care and that's one of reasons that they go to the trauma centers rather than a number of other hospitals which are certified different things. The... under this Bill, are you setting up, whereby all hospitals would then make available this children trauma care? Or do the ones that at the present time have trauma care units provide that service?"
- Cullerton: "Pay attention. No. This does not change the that the victims are supposed to be brought to. The reason why those five hospitals are there is they have the facilities to take care of those... those needs. In fact, the whole theory of the thing is for to be brought to the hospital that can't handle them. this Bill says is that, with regard the Medicaid reimbursement, the reimbursement αf those hospitals with their public aid patients, they re going to get their money out of a separate fund that will more

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

adequately reimburse those hospitals so they can continue to provide these specialized services."

- Terzich: "Well, isn't that true with regard to all Medicaid? I mean, are there any other types of services that provide more money for services, or are we just specializing children care rather than adult care? Why would we just say children only that come under Medicaid rather than anybody who comes under the Medicaid program?"
- Cullerton: "Hell, the reason for that, I think, the justification for that, is that the costs of providing emergency care to pediatric victims is higher than the cost of providing trauma care to any victim. The reason for that is they need separate machines. They need smaller machines. They need more... it's just a more costly type of service. You don't have as many doctors that are specialized in that area. Those are some of the reasons for the distinction."
- Terzich: "Well. I would assume that if it's an emergency case, regardless of whether it was a Medicaid patient is that the hospital would have to patient, regardless of what the circumstances would be. So what difference would it make if a hospital did receive that type of a patient and they weren't satisfied with their reimbursement under Medicaid. They would still have to administer treatment. Then the question would be is, whether or not the hospital is satisfied with reimbursement."
- Cullerton: "Right. As Ι understand... A5. . . Right. Δς understand the I-Care program. with regard to emergency treatment... I'm trying to answer that question with regard to... your question deals with the issue of what about anybody else who is not a child who gets injured and is brought to a... "
- Terzich: "If a patient goes to a hospital and it's an emergency

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

case, they treat that person regardless of if it's a child or anyone else, whether they are covered for Medicaid, or whether they're covered for insurance, or whether they don't have any coverage at all."

Cullerton: "That's right."

Terzich: "I assume that a hospital has to treat emergency patients."

Cullerton: "Yes."

Terzich: "To the best of their ability, whether or not they have any special care or not. So what difference would it make if an emergency patient went to a hospital, then did receive the treatment, all you're talking about is some type of reimbursement through a Medicaid plan."

Cullerton: "Well, the only way I can answer that is to answer as

I did before. The costs are higher at the hospitals that

treat children victims."

Terzich: "So, it doesn't deny him treatment."

"No, but see the problem is that these hospitals. these five hospitals, for example, in the Chicago area that volunteered for this specialized care, they volunteered pursuant to a suggestion by an ordinance that these are the best hospitals to handle these kids. If they drop out of that program, then those Chicago fire department ambulances won't bring a kid to those hospitals. They'll bring them to the closest hospital to where the accident occurred, and as a result that child won't get the treatment that is The regs that you would come under as a fire department ambulance driver right now, pursuant to this Ordinance, you're directed to bring that kid to one of those five hospitals. Am I right?"

Terzich: "Right."

Cullerton: "Now, if they drop out of that program, then you can't bring them there. You can't bring them... you can't drive

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

past... you can't drive past. You'll go to the closest hospital."

Terzich: "No, that's right. No, that's not..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, your five minutes are up. Please bring your remarks to a close."

Terzich: "Hell, I don't think that would be true, because they would designate wherever, for whatever treatment, up certain hospitals that the ambulances would still set would respond to. They're not going to check a list to see whether they re for children care or senior care or for the blind or the handicapped to find out whether or not specialize in certain treatment. They would still have their designated hospitals, and that's exactly where thev So I don't... I don't know what purpose this would . OP would do."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Hill, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, Would

the Sponsor leave for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Regan: "John, we heard this in Committee and I was asking some questions when the new Committee structure that was set up caused everybody to dash out of the Committee, but the question has been covered a little bit, but it's in regards to the negotiations that go on between the Department and the hospitals. You're indicating that there isn't any negotiation, that the Department sets up what they feel is a fair amount of money and the hospitals can take it or leave it. Is that correct?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I would say the negotiations are kind of one  ${\tt sided} \bullet {\tt "}$ 

Regan: "Alright, if the hospitals just absolutely... and I can understand why it costs more money to treat injured children than it would normally... if that's the case,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

then the negative thing of this is that they say, well, then we just want to drop out of the program. Why don't we just let them drop out of the program and then force the Department back into a better negotiating position? Let's keep the negotiations in the Bill. What your Bill is doing is just removing the whole aspect of I-Care, and the reason that we save money in the first place, isn't it?"

I think that it's... I think that it's limited Cullerton: enough to this specific area, that is pediatric trauma, the benefits of that vou\*re not jeopardizing the competitive nature of the negotiating process. You If they just drop out of the program. the problem is this. what really happens... this is what I was trying to explain to Representative Terzich. If your child is injured in a drowning, let's say they break through the ice and they are an emergency care victim, they're going to he brought. let's say this happens in the Chicago area, they're going to be brought to the closest hospital, even though don't have all the facilities that would be needed to save that child's life. So the kid dies. If the ordinance enacted, as it has been in Chicago, it says you're not supposed to take them to the closest hospital, you're supposed to take them to one of these five hospitals. Thev show up there, they might save the life. Okay. So the problem is, that's where you get to the health care If you don't have this incentive for these hospitals to stay in the program, they're going to drop out and then going to have the reason to push to bring the vou\*re not kids to the proper hospital in the first place."

Regan: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker. I don't think the hospitals would drop out. I think that they would argue a little bit, fight a little bit, certainly put up a Bill like this so that they can double their profits, that's all... that's

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

The Department certainly has verv nice. a right to negotiate in good faith with the hospitals and T think that to a certain extent. I also feel that done this is the absolute destruction of one of the that ever came in. The Sponsor admits himself programs that this is a whittling away of the negotiation hospitals and the Department. What is the next step? The next step would be seniors that take long. care. The middle step would be kidney patients that have to be put on machines. This would go on and on and on until the whole program is destroyed and I would advise a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

  The question is, "Shall the main question be put?" All
  those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In
  the opinion of the Chair the "ayes" have it and the main
  question is put. Representative Cullerton to close."
- Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recognize the concern that some Members have expressed with regard to ٥f the the undermining the I-Care program. I think that the I-Care program has worked very well. I think that the hospitals are eating some costs for public aid recipients. them are in the Chicago area, but I think that that's being made by the cost of the people who pay insurance HD premiums and other users of the hospital, and maybe that's way it has to be. I think I've identified, though, a the very small area where the theory of the I-Care program does And as a result, what we're seeing is not work. that have a program where true health issues are being... are

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

being threatened. Childrens health is being threatened result of the I-Care program. I think that what we should do is set up this fund, see at the end of the vear if we have any money. I know that if we don't have any tax increases we're not going to have any money to fund this. I recognize that. But I'll tell you what. If we are going to have any kind of tax increases, and I'm going to support them, I sure would like to know that this fund has created so that some of this money can go there. I think this is a public health issue that is of importance. I appreciate your patience and I'd appreciate your vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 389 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 48 voting 'aye', voting 'no' and 11 voting 'present', and this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared lost. House Bill 508. Representative Clerk, read the Bill." Preston.

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar 1 is being distributed." Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Before we that go to Order, the Clerk has asked me to announce that all Bills on Supplemental 1 Appropriations Consent Calendar passed by the Constitutional Majority today. Hednesday, Chair, therefore, declares that these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared For the record, I would like to say personally passed. that as to House Bill 1368, I have a conflict of interest in that legislation, and pursuant to the recommendation of the Governmental Ethics Act, I am recorded as not voting on that Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 508, a Bill for an Act to amend the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, for what reason do you rise?"
- Preston: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 507 should be the first Bill,

  I believe, called on that."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, we are on a subject matter call. The Bill next on this list of subject matter under Child Development is 508. Please proceed."
- Preston: "Thank you. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 508 requires that high schools in Illinnis include in their curriculum instruction t o children on parenting and family relations. The purpose of the Bill is a Child Abuse Prevention Bill. High school students are. of course. females in high school. are about to become mothers. I... unfortunately. too often in school itself, and very frequently within a year or two thereafter, and we have found in studies that have been done that some 60% of abusive parents were abused children, this instruction in high schools is necessary to break that vicious cycle. To teach parents to be that the proper response to a child that is crying is not to hit the child. That a child has certain needs. That a certain amount of patience is necessary, and indeed, we've found in Illinois and around the country that it is more difficult to drivers license than it is to become a parent, and this gives some instruction on what parenting means and what the relationship and responsibility of a parent to a might be, and I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 508. And on that question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Ropp: "Representative, does this include the teaching of nutrition for infants?"

Preston: "Yes, it does, Representative,"

Ropp: "In other words, we're passing a Bill now that somewhat does the same thing that we passed legislation not more than an hour ago to also provide the same kind of instruction and teaching for infants."

Preston: "No, Representative, that's not correct. What this Bill it emphasizes the areas of child growth and development, prevention of child abuse, which is really the underlying reason for this 6ill. parenting development, teaching someone what it means to be a parent. Now. to some extent. nutrition is. of course. part of that. importance of nutrition for that child is part of it. The So, if there's other legislation we passed that overlaps, that may be the case. But we do not have, now, in our high instruction on the care, emotional care, if you will, of a child. The awareness to someone who is about to become a parent that abuse of a child is what happens when you emotionally deprive the child or physically abuse the child."

Ropp: "In other words, what we are attempting to do here is to teach or to instruct parents to have TLC for their kids.

Tender loving care."

Preston: "That's basically it. To have tender loving care and what it means to demonstrate that tender loving care. You are correct."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill...' excuse me, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hould the Sponsor yield for a question?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you very much. Representative Preston, I certainly have no quarrel with what you are attempting to do, but as a former educator, could you just alleviate some concerns I have about continual mandating in the curricula. I know how difficult it was when I was a teacher to try and incorporate everything into too short a time that we were being asked to do, and if you could alleviate some concerns that I have on that matter, I'd be more than happy to support your Bill."

Preston: "Hell, Representative, there is no requirement in this legislation as to how much time a school district may spend. That's optional with the school district. It's also optional with the school district how they fit it into their curriculum. They might fit it into their existing health curriculum, physical education curriculum, science curriculum or social science curriculum. That, again, is discretionary with the school district. So it really does add a mandate to what the school system must provide, but it leaves it very flexible so that that school system may provide it any which way it desires and sees necessary and within what they can afford."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Co∺lisha⊎."

Cowlishaw: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Preston, I believe this legislation says grades 9 through 12. Is that correct?"

Preston: "That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "Alright, I want to make sure that I understand and that our school people know. That does not mean that this instruction has to be offered in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12, does it?"

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

- Preston: "Representative, it does mean that, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

  It is highly insufficient to have the school in a health class mention the emotional needs of a child one time and expect high school students to absorb that and continue to march on that program. It has to be repeated, just as we repeat science in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 and English and math and the other subjects."
- Cowlishaw: "I understand that this is probably among the best intentioned things that anybody has ever presented here.

  Your things always are, but I still have to say, out of absolute conviction, we keep graduating students from high schools in this state who cannot read, or write or compute, but maybe they'll be really good parents. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

  Representative Preston to close. Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that this has been adequately discussed and I just ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 508 pass?" All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Π'n thic question there are 87 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no' and 3 voting \*present\*. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 546, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bill 546, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Madam Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to bring this

  Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an

  Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. The Bill is on Second. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Madam Speaker, I'd ask leave to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Are there any further

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen n f Amendment @2 becomes the Bill. The House Bill the House. 546. itself. was a shell Bill. This Amendment really amends the Public Aid Code in relation to job and encourages public aid recipients, who are seeking those job search services, to be directed to or advised of early childhood development programs and day training programs to include that the care type in that the Department of Public Aid advises these parameters public aid recipients of so that we can encourage people to seek occupations i n child care, early childhood development, whether as paraprofessionals or as, later on, perhaps, trained professionals."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
Amendment &2 to House Bill 546. And on that question, the
Gentleman from Will. Representative Regan."

Regan: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House.

With all due respect to my fellow friend and hearty worker,

I've got to protest, maybe lightly, because the absolute

contents of these Amendments were never discussed in

Committee and were never discussed by us. These shell

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Bills, we've seen more and more of them come out of this House, where they are just shoved aside and suddenly an Amendment comes up on Second Reading and there is the Bill. It totally makes end runs around the Committee structure and I just want our Membership on this side to know that as the spokesman of the Child Committee, we have not taken any notice of what these are, what the fiscal impact is, so heware.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just in response to Representative Regan's remarks, first of all, there is zero fiscal impact on this Amendment. It was very adequately discussed in our Committee. Irving Harris came and spent hours talking to our Committee, as did others, on the need for these kind of training programs and all this Amendment does is have the Department of Public Aid recommend to people looking for job search assistance, some direction, some encouragement to, perhaps, seek that job... those jobs in childhood child care programs. That's all it does."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Preston now asks
leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 546. Is
there any objection? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman
has leave. Proceed, Mr.... Representative Preston."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 546, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

50th Legislative Day

Hay 20, 1987

the House. This Bill, the Amendment we discussed, is the complete Bill. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote. It costs nothing. It just tries to direct people into child care occupations."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 546. And on that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker, Members of the House. Just for a little clarification, Lee. What are we... what are we directing them to do? Look for jobs for children in coal mines, or what is the situation here? He need to know what this is all about."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

- Preston: "That question... what this Bill does is, when public aid recipients seek job assistance from the Department of Public Aid, which already exists, this tells the Department of Public Aid to make available to them information on care child development programs as possible choices for their seeking employment. That's all this There's a need in early... there's a need in childhood development programs in child care services, there aren\*t enough qualified people in those programs. So, when a public aid recipient is seeking job service advice, I go to find a job, Public Aid is directed to give them child care service information on opportunities employment. That's all it does."
- Regan: "I thank you. That sounds like a fine idea. Give them a brochure and send them out the door with a ... "
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 546 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative

  Terzich, do you wish to explain your vote? No. Turn off

  the Gentleman's light. Have all voted who wish? Have all

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 547, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 547, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Madam Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to bring this back... this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill...
return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the
purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no
objection, the Gentleman has leave. Are there any
Amendments filed, Hr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment \$1.0

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Are there any further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$2 is being offered by Representative Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #2 to House Bill 547 does, is, first of all, it becomes the Bill. 547 was a shell Bill. What this Amendment does is, it encourages the Department of Children and Family Services to provide demonstration, four demonstration projects, based on what has been called the Beethoven Project, which is a program of prenatal care,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

early childhood care, again, to prevent the giant costs that are otherwise experienced by families that public aid, welfare, low income families that don't have that kind of care available to them and don\*t advantage of that kind of care, the cost to the state is astronomical. In children, infants that are born and hirth ₩eight, are sick and need intensive The savings can be really of a giant hospitalization care. amount of money by providing what amounts to a very amount of prenatal care, and this is based on the Beethoven Project that now exists in the City of Chicago at Cabrini We're asking the Department to have project. if you will. at the Taylor Homes at East St. Louisa in Springfield and tο report... tο keep the statistics and report back to TΕ us. those of vou. Representative McCracken, who might have some problem Amendment ∅1. if you\*11 look at Amendment 02. it is a discretionary type program with the Department. the concerns of the Department. If vou\*11 notice, Amendment #1, which was withdrawn, required them to conduct these four pilot projects. Amendment #2 encourages them to conduct these pilot projects, and I'm sure, therefore, Representative, you would like to get on as a hyphenated Cosponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$22 to House Bill 547. Before we have discussion of that, however, the Chair would like to recognize the Secretary of the State of Illinois, Jim Edgar. Welcome. On Amendment \$2 to House Bill 547, Representative Ropp is recognized."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hould the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative Preston, it sounds exactly like the same

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

words that we heard when Representative Currie introduced her Bill. I guess the question... she is attempting to already do what you are trying to set up, a study to find out if we need to be doing. Why do we need this Amendment?"

- Preston: "Okay. It is, first of all, this is not a study. This is to do it in four new locations. The study has already been done. The effectiveness has been overwhelmingly proved, not just in Illinois, but in other states. But in Illinois, in Chicago, it has already been done through this Beethoven Project and it's effectiveness has been shown to be overwhelming. And when I say effectiveness, I mean in terms of dollars saved to the State of Illinois."
- Ropp: "Yes, but I thought her program was to take care of all of those people who, in fact, are on public aid and need assistance for infants and youth because they are underweight and they are malnourished and everything. It seems like we have already taken care of that problem once.

  Why do we need this one now?"
- Preston: "This... this program isn't based on poverty level,
  Representative, alone. It's based on a target location.

  Target communities, that have been shown to be needing
  these kind of programs in order to save dollars to the
  State and in order to save what amounts to the human
  evaluation, the human worth itself, the human value in the
  savings of life and health of low weight newborn babies."
- Ropp: "But those areas that you pointed out, like the Robert Taylor Homes, if those areas, as I understand it, fall in somewhat that poverty area, and it seems like that problem has been addressed by Representative Currie's legislation, and it does not seem that we need to designate four areas if, in fact, we're attempting to deal with all of them under her legislation that's already passed."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Preston: "Representative, it is unrealistic to think that we can deal with all the problems of a lack of prenatal and infant care in Illinois through any legislation that we just passed. whether it be Representative Currie's or mine. What is very clear, is that there are areas of the State that have an overflow number of children who end up dying because they are not cared for properly as fetuses. are not cared for properly as newborns, and those lives can saved and those children that otherwise, who survive. but survive unhealthily, can be made healthy by providing a small... you know you've heard a drop of prevention is worth an ounce of cure. That's exactly what this program And where do you take that ounce of prevention? You it to the high target, high need areas, and we're asking the Department to do that in four such sites. The effectiveness has been proven. Δt Committee the OΠ Children that many of us have been active on, we had Irving Harris and a number of people testify at length about effective this program is. and instead of agina statewide, where there are not enough resources to effective job. if you start off with the target high risk areas, and we know where those areas are, we can he extremely effective in saving lives and saving dollars. And that's what this Bill asks the Department to do."

Ropp: "Hell, I understand. It just seems like one of the two Bills would take care of the problem and that both of them, at this point in time, do not need supporting, even though we are attempting to do the same thing. I guess a baby in my own county that needs this kind of care ought to be able to qualify just as much as one in these four targeted areas, and I thought that under the Representative Currie's Bill, that public aid was to address all of those kids that needed help for those mothers who are under 18, and I kind

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

of think that's exactly what you are attempting to do here."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, that's not a question.

Let's move on to the next speaker, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ryder: "Representative, prior to this Amendment, this Bill was a mandate. It required the projects. Is that correct?"

Preston: "That is correct, Representative."

Ryder: "With the Amendment it is purely permissive."

Preston: "That is correct."

Ryder: "Okay. And the Department has the sole discretion to do or not to do... or to expand the projects."

Preston: "That is correct."

Ryder: "You've indicated that the Beethoven Project, as they are currently established, has been very successful. I, however, had some concern because I didn't think the Beethoven Project had been in existence that long to prove its value."

Preston: "It has been in existence approximately a year. It's necessity... the value of the program is overwhelming, and it has been overwhelmingly acclaimed by national authorities, and I just want to point out the Department of Children and Family Services has withdrawn its objection to this Bill. I'd like, especially Members on the other side of the aisle to underscore that, if Representative McCracken is listening. I hope he understands.... "

Ryder: "Representative Preston, I'm listening and I'll be glad to do that."

Preston: "Thank you, Representative Ryder. I wish you would make some Members aware that the Department has withdrawn its objection."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Ryder: "Hould you be specific as to the value. Has it been made in empirical terms?... of the results?"

Preston: "To some extent, yes. Now, because it's only... the
Beethoven Project has been in existence only approximately
a year, the final report is not yet in, but in empirical
terms and what already has been observed and what has been
seen, it is considered to be of tremendous value in
reducing future costs to the State. I don't mean in the
distant future, I mean immediate future, and in human
values. in human terms. it has saved lives."

Ryder: "To the Amendment, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Ryder: "Thank you. I would like to reinforce what the has just indicated. Prior to this Amendment there was, and good reason, should have been a down arrow on this item because it was requiring some expenses that we didnot necessarily feel were appropriate. The Beethoven Project has been proved to be a good Bill, to be a good idea and good project. Because of the cooperation of the Sponsor, he is now withdrawing from the Department of Children Family Services, the mandate, or the requirement, and simply making it permissive. He makes a good idea and The Department of Children and Family makes it better. Services does not take a position on the Bill. They have position of opposition and, as such, a good removed their idea has become better, and I think we should Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Preston now asks
  leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 547 on
  Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none,
  the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Third, Mr.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 547, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. I think this Bill has been adequately discussed on
  Second Reading and I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 547 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? The Clerk will take the record. question there are 107 voting 'ave', 6 voting none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have taken a lot of time on these 8i11s and they are important Bills, but let's remember that it took us an hour to discuss the last four Bills, and to the extent we spend time today, we have less time at the end of week, so let's... let's only say those things that are absolutely necessary and ask those questions that are absolutely necessary for the edification of the Members. Representative McCracken, for what reason do vou rise?"
- McCracken: "Just to agree with the Speaker. None of our Bills are on this Call, and we're interested in having all the Bills heard, both sides of the aisle, whether they are on the Special Call or not, and we, as Republicans, are assuring the Body that we want to cooperate in that regard. So, when Friday comes and your Bill isn't called, look to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the Podium, not to us."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, for what reason do you rise."
- Ewing: "Madam Speaker, I have been in this chamber a number of years and this Session particularly we've been admonished by the Chair to only ask those questions that are pertinent and only to say what is very educational to all the Members of this Body. I wonder if maybe you could put out a memo from the Speaker's Office so that we'd know exactly what fits in to your guidelines. You know, it's a little difficult for us to follow your guidelines. It seems like it's only when you want to move the Bills that those guidelines come into effect. We need a little more of your advice."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing, my remarks were not intended to be insulting. They were meant for all Hembers.

  I'm just trying to move things along as quickly as possible. Representative Preston on House Bill 548."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 548, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the prevention of developmental disabilities.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, for what reason do you rise?"
- flinn: "Well. Madam Speaker, 1 don\*t ₩ant to Representative Preston, but I do agree with what you had to say a few moments ago. Yesterday Representative Kulas aot and reprimanded the people for talking too long. Αn hour later I did. Now the Republicans over there, that I get along with just fine normally, as soon as I got through speaking, one of them got up and didn't speak five minutes, but spoke twelve minutes on a Bill, and the Speaker didn't call him to task. Now, I think, unless the Speaker puts on

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the timer and all of us really do what we say we're going to do, we're going to be here and a lot of Bills will die. As far as I'm concerned, I've got some that can die with yours, but I'll help you, if you want me to. I'll get up and talk, too."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston on House Bill 548."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd ask leave of the House to bring this Bill back for the purpose of an Amendment. Back to Second Reading."

Speaker Breslin: The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill
548 to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an
Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the
Gentleman has leave. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr.
Clerk?

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &1 is being offered by Representative Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston on Amendment 81."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment &1 does is become the Bill. It requires the Department of Mental Health to grant at least one grant to conduct a research project of the various teen suicide prevention programs that have been disseminated throughout the state and are being used by various schools throughout the state, to gauge the effectiveness of those programs and report back with that information."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 548. And on that question, there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. \*Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?\* All those in favor \*aye\*, those opposed say \*no\*. In the opinion of the Chair the \*ayes\* have it. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Hallock, for what reason do you recognition? This Amendment has already been adopted,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Hearing no objection, the

Sir."

Hallock: "Hell, I'll speak to the Bill, then."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any further Amendments, Ar. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Preston now asks

leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 548, as

Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Third, Hr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 548, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act

relating to the prevention of developmental disabilities.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

amended. Does he have leave?

As I indicated, this will have Preston: "Thank you. the Department of Mental Health give a research grant to study the various teen suicide prevention programs that exist and evaluate those programs tο determine demonstrations or programs had a positive impact, which did have a positive impact. What was the relative impact of programs on the school where it's been used. ⊌hat components of the school program are most successful, so that we can begin to develop some model for use by schools. Some body of information for schools that are interested in adopting a program. What we have now is a lot of programs... a lot of schools acting independently and we don't know, because this is a new area. what the effectiveness of their programs are. He need research... that basic research. Since they are doing it, and since this is a very sensitive area, we wan t to know what is effective and what, indeed, is not effective."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of
House Bill 548. And on that question the Gentleman from
Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you. Hill the Sponsor yield for a question?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hallock: "My first question is, how did you manage to have so many Bills on the Calendar on the same subject and not have them collapse into one Bill? We Republicans had a lot of good ideas, but they were all urged to be collapsed or defeated. You somehow have the fortitude and the tenacity to get numerous Bills on the same topic and still can persevere. How did that happen?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "That's a good question."

Speaker Breslin: "You are to confine your questions and remarks to the substance of the Bill."

Hallock: "Well, I think I did."

Speaker Breslin: "No, Sir. I don't think you did. Would you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Hallock: "Hell, he shook his head like this, so I guess I got an answer. Regarding the issue itself. I would like to know if your efforts here will be dealt with through one provider who will have agencies around the state, or will you deal with different state providers in all communities as separate entities, or how will this be... how will you... how are you going to proceed on this?"

Preston: "Well, first of all, much of that is up to the

Department of Mental Health, but what is envisioned is that

there be one umbrella provider who... one umbrella

grantee, researcher, if you will, who might ask different
entities out there to look at different areas."

Hallock: "Will that provider be based in Rockford, Illinois, probably?"

Preston: "That would be up to the Department of Hental Health."

Hallock: "That would probably be a good suggestion, though, wouldn't it?"

Preston: "I think Rockford would be an excellent place to have a

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

provider, yes."

- Hallock: "I guess my question is, I mean, do you have somebody in mind, without being facetious, I mean, do you have somebody in mind that you anticipate might be the likely provider for this?"
- Preston: "I do not. There are a number of organizations that, if

  I were asked and if the Department were interested, I could

  recommend to them that have done excellent jobs on

  reviewing a number of programs like this, and putting a

  number of programs into place."
- Hallock: "But it is your intention that the Department Itself

  make that determination."
- Preston: "Yes. Of course, it is. And this is not a... a patronage ploy for me in any way. I'm just looking for this information. The concern was raised that we have a lot of people that are concerned about the extremely sensitive area of teen suicide. Schools are... and communities are attempting to deal with it, and we don't have the basic knowledge as to whether or not what they are doing is effective or harmful, what's good, what should be emulated and what should not."
- Hallock: "Does... is there any one group in our state that does have the right answers in this area, or is a right answer really almost undefinable?"
- Preston: "That's a difficult one. We, the people I have spoken
  to who are knowledgeable, don't know all the right answers.

  That's why we want the programs studied to see which ones
  seem to be effective, which ones do not."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Hill the Sponsor leave for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Regan: "Representative, is this a one year program, a two year program?"

Preston: "Representative, by existing law, without this legislation, it is already a five year program. What this legislation does is to put into these grants for research that the Department of Mental Health already gives out, to require one of those grants to review and research and report back on the effectiveness of the teen suicide prevention programs that exist throughout Illinois."

Regan: "Well, I think it's a good approach, and I agree with you that experts don't seem to know, so maybe some experience in this area is well taken. I support the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Madam Speaker, I have basically two questions. Hould the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Parcells: "The first one is more of a curiosity. As to the last three Bills, all came out as a shell, and this was referred to before, and I wondered if you didn't have your legislation in mind at the time or whether this had to be a compromise, or is there some other reason?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parcells. Representative Parcells, the rules provide that you are to speak to the subject matter of the Bill in question. We are not here discussing procedure. Do you wish to speak to the Bill in substance, proceed."

Parcells: "Alright. I'll ask him that question later, then, privately. I wondered how much is in the budget right now for teen suicide, is in this budget?"

Preston: "Last year in the budget there was \$500,000.00."

Parcells: "And would this require any more money for the Department to do this?"

Preston: "No. It would not."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Parcells: "This will be provided for from... "

Preston: "This will be provided, assuming that that \$500,000.00 is continued this year, this will be as part of it."

Parcells: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is. 'Shall House Bill 548 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? this will take the record. On question there are 111 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 655, Representative Flowers. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative... Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"
- Parke: "Yes. Inadvertently I was in the aisle at the time the vote was taken. I would have voted 'yes', if the record could show that, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "Let the record so reflect. Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill on House 3ill 655."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 655, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to bring House Bill 655 back for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment.

  Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representatives Flowers and Barnes."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Flowers: "Withdraw, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw @1. Are there any further Amendments?

Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &2 is being offered by

Representative Flowers."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative..."

Flowers: "Withdraw, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw 02. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Flowers and Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Amendment #3 creates a demonstration project. The project

would establish a model day care program within the school,

dealing with high teenage pregnancy, and I would urge the

adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 655."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment Ø3 to House Bill 655, and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment Ø3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Flowers now asks

leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 655, as

amended. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Lady
has leave. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 655, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Flowers: "I would just urge for the passage of House Bill 655,
please."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House And on that question, is there Bill 655, as amended. discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 655 pass?\* All those in favor vote "aye", 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who opposed vote wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are voting \*ave\*, none voting \*no\*. and none 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 916. Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 916, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen o f School Code relating to... Houses This amends the regarding the teacher shortage in our already existing scholarship program and it expands the program to include individuals who pursue child development, early childhood education programs. There is a great need in Illinois for people who are trained in early childhood development early childhood education programs, so the scholarships that are awarded should include people who are pursuing graduate and undergraduate and post graduate training in that area of development, because we need those people, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote and be glad to answer questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of
House Bill 916. And on that question, the Gentleman from
Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Hallock: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Preston: "Of course."

Hallock: "Is this your first Bill?"

Preston: "Yes, it is, Representative."

Hallock: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 916 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1001, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1001, a Bill for an Act to provide special support services for handicapped youth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1001 establishes an experiment to be run by the State Board of Education in something called Special Use Support Services. It is basically an extended day program for special education kids. It is an effort placement in residential settings, which as we all know, are quite expensive, and to enhance the development of all handicapped youth. This Bill has the support of the It came out of Committee with no State Board of Education. dissenting votes. I move for its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... the Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1001. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1001 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take who wish? the record. On this question there are... there are 76 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, The Chair would remind Members hereby declared passed. that all Bills on the Order of Children will be called on this Special Call. However, we are doing this under special subject matter. So if we pass over your don't be worried about it. He will get back to you under the subject matter call under Child Protection. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative AcCracken."

- McCracken: "That's comforting for the other side of the aisle,

  Madam Speaker, but we were told that Government

  Administration and Government Initiatives is where the

  emphasis would be laid, where there is a more equitable

  distribution of Bills between the parties."
- Speaker Breslin: "I don't know anything about that,

  Representative McCracken, but I will certainly look into

  it."
- McCracken: "Hill you? Please do."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 1723, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, is a fairly simple, straight forward Bill. Ιt provides that in the truant alternative programs. which we established as part of the School Reform Initiative αf 1985, that those programs can also... that the funds for those programs can also be used to furnish day care to children of students who participate in that program.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

There is no fiscal impact to this Bill. T t merely that those programs can be available to women or to sure young men who have child care responsibilities while thev participate in the alternative school program." choose to Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of 1723. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed A 1 1 Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? vote 'no'. all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1868, Representative Hannig. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1868, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currieo"

School Code.

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Mambers of the House.

This Bill would provide for the opportunity for the State

Board of Education to establish pilot projects to develop

school curricula that will help youngsters deal with

problems of substance use and abuse. The pilot programs

will include notions about peer activities and will be

targeted to those young people, high school youth, who are

especially at risk for developing drug abuse problems. I

would appreciate your questions, welcome your support."

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 1868. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1868 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no',

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the subject matter call of Child Protection appears House Bill 93. Representative Curran. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk Leone: "On page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 93, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."

you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Bill 93 amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. It requires the Department of Children and Family Services to develop a plan for a two-year voluntary program for training, retraining and education, to report back to January 1. 1988. It also requires the Department to assess the feasibility of computerizing case work functions and investigative functions in certain regions of the state on a pilot program basis, to report to us οn January 1988. and requires the Department to notify certain indicated and unfounded cases of the availability Ωf private social services. I don\*t think there's anv objection to this Bill by anybody. and I ask for a favorable Roll Callo

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of 93. And on that question. House Bill is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall House Bill 93 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will record. On this question there are 111 voting 'ave', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 97, Representative Curran. Clerk, read the Bill."

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 97, a 3ill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currano"
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This... Madam Speaker, leave to take this Bill back to Second Reading to adopt an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
  the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, the
  Gentleman has leave. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr.
  Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &7... correction, floor amendment &6 being offered by Representative Curran."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Move to adopt Amendment #6. It puts the Bill in the position we wish to have it in. It adopts a 30:1 case load for follow-up workers, 12:1 for investigative services."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 06 to House Bill 97. And on that question the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "I did not hear the explanation of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The explanation of the Amendment was that it puts the Bill in its final form and then they can debate the Bill on Third Reading. Do you wish to have a further explanation?"
- Ewing: "Will he... will he plan to explain the Bill to us then when he gets to Third Reading?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Move for the adoption of the Amendment. Did you want to talk about it now, Tom, or do you want to talk about it on Third Reading."
- Ewing: "I just want to know..."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "He's agreed to talk about it on Third Reading, so the Gentleman has asked for the adoption of Amendment \$26. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment 07, being offered by Representative

Curran."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Move to withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #7. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Curran now asks
leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 97, as
amended. Are there any objections? Hearing none, read the
Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk, as amended."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 97, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Ewing, what House Bill 97 now does, as is it moves the Department of Children and Family amended. Services, over a five year period, to adopt a caseload average within a region, within all the regions throughout the state, of 30:1 for child protective services, for child welfare services, that's the caseload, the follow-up caseload, and 12:1 for the investigative caseload. There's some... and the reason for this is that the aroups nationally, such as the National Association for Social Workers, the National Association for the Prevention of Child Abuse, have analyzed the ability of a caseworker handle a caseload, and have determined that the caseload

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- ought to be 25:1. We're somewhere around 45:1 in Illinois and what we want to do is move not toe 25:1, which is the national recommendation, over a five year period, but to 30:1 over a five year period."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption... the passage of House Bill 97. And on that question, the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Representative... so that basically your Bill now is going to phase in a requirement that the caseload be reduced from around 40 to 30 per caseworker."
- Curran: "That's right."
- Ewing: "Yes. Now did you tell me there were two different categories, one for child..."
- Curran: "Yes, there are the follow-up workers and then there are investigators. The investigators are handling about 18 to 20 cases per investigator now. That should drop down to about 12."
- Ewing: "Representative, is this... is this mandated in the law that a caseworker have no more than 30 or an investigator no more than 12?"
- Curran: "No. H۵ were verv careful not t o dο that. What we're talking about Representative. here is an average caseload per region, and it is not a maximum. Somebody might be carrying 35 or 40, but the average per region, in order to serve the children State of Illinois well would be 30:1 for follow-up work."
- Ewing: "The question I have about this, and I have some serious concerns about this legislation, while I think that the objective is laudable, I would imagine that the Department is now aiming towards that now. Why do we have to put it into law?"
- Curran: "I think the Department would like for us to... I think
  the Department would probably appreciate having the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

resources to help the children of this state in the way the individual workers there... I think the reason we put it in law is we need to hold ourselves to a commitment. this year to make a commitment to the abused. need neglected, tortured, murdered children of this state. Нe do it. And this doesn't move us all the way to It moves us about two-thirds of where we should be. doesn't do i t all at once. It does it over a period of five years."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. T think what the Sponsor has said is true, but let's look at this. There is a cost, on our estimate this legislation, of 15 million dollars. Now he may deny that. but Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a major cost tο this legislation if we follow it. Now. too often. in the areas like this, such... "

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing."

"Yes. Ewing: In the area of pensions, that's a good example, we say we're going to do something, and then we don't. is another example of that. We're going to put it in the law that we're going to reduce the caseload, and we won\*t it if we don't have the money. If we do it, it's going dο to cost us 15 million. I'm saying to you that every through the budgetary process. That's the time for the Department to come in, and for the Budget Committees, Appropriation Committees to decide how much we can do We look foolish. He look very foolish when that vear. Me go home and we pass Bills like this and we don't live up to if we are going to live up to it, we them. Otherwise, better plan to put a lot of millions of dollars into and all of you who vote for it, plan to vote for the tax increase. I suggest we vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Yes."

Frederick: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

While I hate to disagree with my illustrious leader, I

think this has been a major problem with DCFS for a long
time and I would hope that the phase in is not impossible
to reach and that we will reduce the number of cases that
we require caseworkers to have and to research, so I

support this Bill. I hope everyone will vote green."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder, Representative Ryder, do you seek recognition?"

Rvder: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this As a Cosponsor of this Bill, Representative Curran 8111. and I have worked very long and hard attempting to we believe is in the best interests of the Department of Children and Family Services. Let me there are several ways in which we can get to the approved ratio. some of which are by some common-sensical going to take a look at the number of evample. we\*re calls and cases that are referred, some of which may not need DCFS to handle. Additionally, we're taking a look at the manner in which some of them are handled. Maybe doesn't need to handle some that they are currently handling. Maybe they are only monitoring those cases. and that's the situation, and Catholic Charities or Jewish Charities or some other of the private agencies of the Illinois are taking a look at them, then this State of ratio can achieve this point without the kind o f expenditures that are being debated. He worked very hard on this Bill. We have passed up some other opportunities that may have been far more expensive to do a phase in on what I think is an appropriate priority and expenditure for the State of Illinois. As such, I would indicate that we should support this concept for the kids of the State, for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the State of Illinois, and for all of our best interests.

I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 97 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 99, Representative Curran. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 99, a Bill for an Act in relationship to child abuse and neglect. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Curran: House Bill 99 is the agreed Bill that came out of the Child Protection Subcommittee and the State Government In that, House Bill 99 is a rather long Bill. Committee. It encompasses the legislation of several legislators. Representative Bowman, Representative Woicik, Representative Daley。 What the Bill does is, it requires the Department of Children and Family Services to be the single state agency for the planning and coordination of child. abuse prevention programs. It requires the Department to contact the victims of child abuse as soon as possible, rather than just looking into the environment of the child. It permits the Department to define by rule the basis for extensions of investigations. It requires the Department to do training programs regarding essential procedures and then the subject matter of investigative Representative Bowman's, Representative Ho ic ik and Representative Daley's Amendments. And I think there's probably no disagreement on House Bill 99 and I'd ask

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 99. And on that question. is there anv Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House discussion? Bill 99 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question, there are 113 voting 'ave', 1 record. voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill. received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 378, Representative Rice. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 378, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rice."

- Rice: "Madam Speaker, Assembly, this Bill is produced to amend the Criminal Code that creates an offense in contributing to the criminal delinquency of a minor. It provides that any person over 21 years old who has anything to do with a juvenile under 17, that would become involved and would be dealt with as a felony, with the exception of murder, which would be considered a Class X... Class 5 felony... Class 10 felony. Consequently, I ask your support and your vote... favorable vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 378. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Hill the Gentleman vield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield."
- Countryman: "Representative Rice, I've been here about four years now, and I don't recall you... how many times you presented a Bill. Is this your first Bill?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

Speaker Breslin: To think the answer to that is yes,

Representative Countryman. Do you have any further

questions?

Countryman: "Thank you. No."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

don\*t Johnson: 17 F7 honestly... I kno₩ whether. because Representative Rice is so soft-spoken or because I'm deaf, or because there's background noise, but I honestly and have no idea what this Bill does at all. explain again what the elements of this new offense are? I agree, one of the problems is we don't have enough crimes Illinois. We need to double our stocks so we can build two or three more penitentiaries and I m anxious to help in this process. There's virtually... Representative Cullerton and I both agree that our criminal laws are just short-sighted now and we ought to expand them more. just want to see what this new crime is going to be."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "To reiterate, it creates the offense of contributing to the criminal delinquency of a juvenile, provides that any person of the age of 21 and upwards who, with the intent to promote or facilitate the commission of a felony, aids or directs a person under age 17 in the commission felony, commits the offense of contributing... contributing to the criminal delinquency of a juvenile and is guilty of a felony one grade higher than the offense committed, except when the offense committed is murder or Class 10 In the case of murder or that Class, the shall be the same as those offense, respectively."

Johnson: "Okay. Hell, I think, obviously the intention of your legislation, and I'm not being facetious, I understand you are sincere, the intention of the legislation would be to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

address those situations then where you have adults who are using juveniles to commit armed robberies and that sort of thing. Is that right? $^{\pi}$ 

Rice: "Basically, we're dealing with drugs, Representative."

Johnson: "Okay. I guess... I guess one of my questions would be,
if the individual has to be guilty, among other things, of
soliciting, aiding, abetting, conspiring and so forth,
wouldn't they be guilty under current law as an accomplice
anyway?"

Rice: "Yes."

Johnson: "Are you sure you're not downgrading the penalty?

Because right now, if you have an adult, or anyone,
facilitate, aid and abet the commission of a crime, they
are guilty of the crime itself, as an accomplice, and so
you could have a situation where somebody that facilitates
a Class X or a Class 1 drug offense, who'd be guilty as an
accomplice today, and what you are saying by this Bill is
that you're guilty of only a Class A misdemeanor if you do
that. Is this intended to be cumulative, along with the
possibility of a conviction of the underlying offense, or

Rice: "It's got to be a felony offense, and it's being treated as

one grade higher than the current... than the offense
itself. And it is current... "

Johnson: "Hell, I understand that it has to be a felony, but...
okay... well, I don't want... I'm certainly not going to
be critical of Representative Rice, because I realize he's
addressing a serious problem, and I'll vote for the Bill.
I think it's well—intended and so forth. I just would want
to be concerned and want to make sure that we're not
muddying up the criminal justice waters by some legislation
that might cause... cause it to be either unfortunately
juxtaposed or somehow contrary to existing criminal law.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

You don't think it does that, right?"

Rice: "No. I don't, Sir."

Johnson: "Okay. I'll vote for the Bill. I think it sounds like a good idea to me."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative

Homer: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. 1 just rise to support Representative Rice's Bill. I think, to simply clarify what I understand he's trying to do here is that, current law. if an individual commits what we call an inchoate offense, for example, solicitation, attempt. or conspiracy, that person has committed an offense that's one lower than the offense otherwise. if vou had committed the offense itself. In other words, an attempted murder is a Class X felony, whereas murder, of course, is penalized at a higher level. What the Gentleman says is where the situation is such that the conspirator or the is over 21 years of age, and the person that he conspires with or solicits to commit the offense the age of 17, that we're going to hold that adult, or that person over 21. to a higher burden and a higher degree of guilt than we are the juvenile who actually goes out and commits the crime, and I think that's a good public policy and I would also note that the Bill is, according to analysis, identical to a Bill from the 84th General Assembly, Senate Bill 970, that passed out of here 2 voting 'present', 58 to 0 in the Senate, the Bill ended up being vetoed by the Governor, but I think with that overwhelming sentiment from the previous Session, the Gentleman still has a good Bill and we ought to all in support of him."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 378 pass?' All those in favor vote

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 421, Representative Curran. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you rise?"

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to commend
  Representative Rice and Representative Goforth for their
  fine service to the people. If the rest of us would follow
  their example, it would probably be a better place to
- Speaker Breslin: "A point well taken. Have you completed... Yes,

  Representative Pullen, for what reason do you rise?"
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I had difficulty with my switch."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "I also have difficulty with my mic, evidently. Would the record please reflect that I would have voted 'aye' on that last Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "The record shall so reflect."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran. On House Bill 421."

Tate: "Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, point of order. I would just like to bring to the attention... "

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me... excuse me. Representative Tate
  was not recognized. Representative Hatijevich, for what
  reason do you rise?"
- Matijevich: "Hell, in the interest of truth in legislation, this
  was not Representative Rice's first Bill. He thought
  someone asked if it is his first Bill this Session, but I

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- commend him in doing anything he can to pass a Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tate, for what reason did you seek recognition?"
- Tate: "Just on a point of personal privilege. Based on the current score right now, the Chicago Cubs are no longer in sole possession of first place."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, have you read this Bill a Third Time?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No. House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran asks leave for this Bill to be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave?

  Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment requires the Department of Children and Family Services to study the impact of nonacceptance of anonymous reports of suspected child abuse. Move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 421. And on that question the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, he will."
- Hallock: "The Bill, as originally introduced, dealt with expungment of the record. Does this Bill still do that?"
- Curran: "It does not."
- Hallock: "Well, then, if the Bill removes the expungment

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

procedures in the Bill, what does it do again, please?"

- Curran: "What the Bill does now, it requires the Department to respond to us by January 1, 1988, what the impact on their responsibilities to serve the children of Illinois would be if they did not accept anonymous reports of child abuse and neglect."
- Hallock: "Well, if I might say so, I respect your right to make
  the Bill what you want it to be, but I happen to think the
  Bill was better in the first place, but I'd support the
  Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment &1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Curran now asks
  leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 421, as
  amended. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the
  Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Third, as amended,
  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Third Reading of
  the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Briefly, Representative Ryder referred to the impact of this Bill in the discussion about House Bill 97 when he said that it is very possible that some of the work that the Department of Children and Family Services is doing now, and therefore has a high caseload ratio, it would not be required to do if we simply analyzed the incoming calls and determined slightly different ways to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

handle those. House Bill 421, therefore, is important. It will get us a report about six or eight months from now, and I think it's worthy of your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of 421. And on that question is there any House Bill Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House discussion? Bill 421 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting... 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting \*present\*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 473, Representative Slater. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 473, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Slater: "Representative Slater."
- Slater: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 474 (sic 473) simply allows the invasion of a trust which has been established by another party for purposes of satisfaction of unpaid child support. I move the adoption... or move the passage of House Bill 473."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage Bill 473. and on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall Bill 473 pass?\* All those in favor vote \*aye\*, all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 507. Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 507, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 507 requires all elementary schools to include in their curriculum instruction to children on how to avoid drug and substance abuse. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 507. And on that question, the Gentleman from Livingson, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ewing: "Does this mandate something to our local schools?"

Preston: "Yes, Representative, it does, but there is no cost attached to the mandate. It requires, again, the schools to include in their curriculum instruction to children in each of the years, kindergarten through 8th grade in the elementary schools, prevention programs, teaching them about drug and substance abuse prevention."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "... Just a moment. There's no... the parents have no consent over this. This is just required."

Preston: "That is correct."

Ewing: "And we start in kindergarten?"

Preston: "That is correct."

Ewing: "He're not going to teach them how to use it, we're just going to teach them about it, is that right?"

Preston: "That is correct."

Ewing: "Why do we start at kindergarten teaching about drugs? I

don't think, in most of our schools, our kindergarten

children are aware of this problem."

Preston: "Well, I'm glad you asked that, Representative. Is is

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

in extremely important that we start at an early age rather than the focus of most programs today to intervene after there is already a problem. The programs that I have seen and that I've been involved with start at the elementary school age, and by doing it in that fashion, by teaching children to avoid the problem that may come through drug usage, you... we will end up, indeed, with a drug free generation, and it's very important to start at the earliest possible age so that they're... children are acclimated to the evils of drug usage.

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, I think I'd like to speak to... ask another question."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Ewing: "Ar. Sponsor, I don't think you've been... that last comment, maybe you haven't been smoking anything."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes."

Preston: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the comment."

Ewing: "Never... we'll just cut that out."

Speaker Breslin: "Good."

Ewing: "How... how... how, Mr. Sponsor, Representative, how are we not going to have any cost if we're going to require this curriculum to be added from kindergarten through high school?"

Preston: "Well, there's total flexibility left to the school systems how they will implement this program. For example, a school system would meet the mandate by having an assembly and inviting the local law enforcement agency in to speak about the evils of drug usage. It's my hope that much more than that will be done, but we want to leave the school systems the creativity to develop programs that other school systems may emulate because they are better programs than might otherwise be available."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The next three Bills. and I don't want to be redundant. I don't to get up and speak the next two Bills plus this, on every one of these, but they all mandate something Now, if it's as light and as easy as the Sponsor savs. then it isn't going to amount to anything. and it's going to cost money, we know how our it's more people feel about being told local school everything. Ladies and Gentlemen, call your superintendents, ask them if they want to be told something. Ask them if thev another mandate. I'll betcha they tell you they don't, but I bet these Bills will fly out of here and they are just aren't going to amount to anything and they really irritate our school people. If our school people are so dense, that they don't know how to put on one of these programs that are no more of a mandate than the then we ought to take over and run the schools. suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. have respect for the Sponsor of this package of Bills and I know that he is sincere in what he is trying to do, but I think that we have to seriously consider what he really would accomplishing if we went along with Children of kindergarten age, and even first and probably a little later than that, are just too and young to be teaching them about such matters as drug abuse. It isn't right. It isn't good, and despite the Sponsor's excellent intentions, I really hope that we do not go along this Bill. I think that it is dangerous. with you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

In response to the last Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. comment. I'm sure the Lady is very well intentioned. couple of weeks ago, Saturday morning, my son, 4 years old... I'm listening to what the cartoons that he's watching for Saturday morning. During those cartoons there comes on apparently a little girl. I didn\*t see the commercial. And apparently a little girl comes on and she's relating... she's relating what took place with her She says that she was wrestling with her uncle. coming across the television, now, she's wrestling with her uncle and all of a sudden it felticky and then Gary Coleman comes on... this is television... Gary Coleman says that if this happens to you, you should report it to somebody. Now, I understand it's not the same subject, but the point is, the point is, that if we can allow that to go across the airwaves, certainly we can handle where we understand what's going schools, on with a specific child, and a specific teacher and specific a school district. and so I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I think it's an excellent idea."

Speaker Breslin: ™The Lady from DuPage, Representative
Cowlishaw.™

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Preston, are you aware of the videotape that was prepared on... at the conference that was held on this...in this House Chamber, Sponsored by the four legislative leaders and many others, I believe it was the 27th of April, on the subject of drug abuse? Are you aware that there was a videotape of that?"

Preston: "I am."

Cowlishaw: "Alright. I would like to point out that if any one

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

of us took the time to view that videotape. discover that we had some experts from the federal level who brought us some astonishing and very recent statistics the whole problem of drug abuse. about One of those is that, whereas, the average age for first use of drugs be the mid teens, I know this is hard to believe, but the average age of first use of drugs in this nation now is 12 1/2 vears. The man who was here to reveal these statistics pointed out to us that, in fact, given that fact, if we do not begin programs about good health practices, which really what I think you are talking is about here, if we do not begin those programs until the junior, or middle school, we are already way too late. That the time to begin these programs is well before child reaches the age of 12 1/2. He pointed out a couple of other things. One, that whereas drug people at first was mostly in inner cities, it now pervades population and he also pointed out increasingly, the preferred drug is cocaine, and in manv cases cocaine in the form that is called \*crack\*, which is probably as highly addictive in as short a time as anything ever known in the drug field. Representative Preston. don't like to burden our schools, and you know my feelings about mandates, but the fact is, that this is tο t he spread o f AIDS. It is related to practically everything that we can ever do to protect the minds these young people so they can learn to read, write and compute. I think we can leave it to the discretion of school people what kind of approach you take to this subject in kindergarten or first grade, and what in the fifth grade. One final question. the DARE program, with which 1 am sure vou must familiar, which involves local law enforcement officials,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

would a school district that had the DARE program in place in that school district, would that qualify them to meet this requirement?"

Preston: "It certainly would."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the previous question is put. Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. This Bill is, in my opinion. the most important Bill. in at least, my child protection package. I have seen these programs. I have seen them done in elementary schools. I brought in some... maybe thousand children from 25 different elementary schools in my district to a location where we put on a program, a drug prevention Ιt drug program. overwhelmingly, as reported by a whole variety of people who fanned out across this audience to ask the children what would you do if somebody offered you drugs. The response ranged from, 'I'd tell a policeman.' to inquiring whether the child looked crazy. "I'm not crazy. you think, I'd take drugs?' Starting at an early These programs will give us a overwhelmingly important. generation. If we do nothina drua free else, this important legislation, I hope you'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 507 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

question, there are 85 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Barger, for what reason do you rise?"

- Barger: "I was going to explain my vote, but considering I didn't have time, I would like just a moment as a matter of personal privilege to say something which I would have said in debate had I been given the opportunity. I think that our social engineers are doing a very fine job, but it is absolutely impossible to replace a mother, which is a thing these children need at home, instead of the help of the Illinois Legislature. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill, having received the Constitutional
  Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 509,
  Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 509, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Prestone"

- "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill 509 relates to the House problem that Representative Curran just mentioned. This requires instruction in grades K through 8 on the avoidance of sexual and physical abuse. What alternatives are available a child if that child finds himself or herself the victim of that type of abuse, the type of programs telling them you shouldn't inform your teacher, inform a parent if a stranger has made attempts at some molestation. and I'd be glad to answer any guestions.
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of
  House Bill 509. And on that question, the Gentleman from
  McHenry, Representative Klemm. Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hill the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

"Representative Preston, I certainly commend you for efforts and I support what you are doing, but I still have a concern even though I'm voting green on your Bills. have a concern about the cost to the local school districts again, we're doing some mandates. I think we all agree they're important mandates, and I think share a concern that some of the programs that are in existence aren't working, simply, and we've got to look at But what do we do with that... local school ideas. districts, many of them still are facing some problems because we haven't had the courage or the money to come up with a new state aid formula for education and that? How can we handle that before this Bill, say, becomes law? What can we do to give them the monies to carry out programs?"

Preston: "Representative, first οf all I . . . T have long appreciated your concern, interest and your always willing to be open on matters. As to House Bill 509, and the others that have to do with the School Code, they specifically designed to be cost free if a school district wanted them to be cost free. A school district that had funds to expend could be more creative and use its assets accordingly. Taking this Bill as an example, the mandate that this Bill has can be satisfied by simply having somebody come in and have an assembly for the time, once a year assembly, which would really be a free cost operation. Maybe the school nurse could talk to children about this problem. Now, that's not my hope. My hope is that a school district will put together a very fine program because there's a wealth of information that's available, a wealth of curricula, so one school system might want to emulate the program of another school system."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Klemm: "If you look... if you look at all the Bills that you've got, it's really more than a one day at the auditorium with one quest speaker. because I know my school districts When I was president of a board of education, we done it. did things way back when. That's a lot of years ago. but vou're asking for more. How can we look at that?"
- Preston: "Well. what I am ... what I am saying is that you can meet the mandate without spending any money. That 's best way to meet the mandate. I agree with you. but as far... if you have a school district cannot afford the funds, they still will be in the purview of the law by doing it with no cost to them. Now if a school district wants to spend more, of course, they can be more creative and use their assets to spend more."
- Klemm: "Well, we do this all the time on mandates You know that. It's not going to cost them much, but it really Maybe before this Bill leaves the Senate, maybe does. at something and maybe you can see if we should give the schools some dollars to maybe implement program and not go in half backwards with this. Thank VOUL
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 509 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? a11 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no', and 2 votina 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House 510, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 510, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Prestono"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

you. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Preston: "Thank the House. This is my final Bill. Thank you. House Bil1 510 has been seen here before. This is the Bill that would first time in Illinois, the introduction for the into evidence of the videotaped testimony, the videotaped statement of the child witness victim of a sexual assault. The Bill twice passed the House and the Senate. out. in the past, some problems that the Governor had in his Amendatory Veto. This Bill is posture it was last year when it again passed the House and the Senate and the Governor amendatorily vetoed it. I am. right now, hoping to have a meeting with the Governor to work out problems that he may have. The Bill provides that a motion of the state, a videotaped statement of the child would be made in the presence of a judge, in the presence of the defense counsel and the accused. Anv objections to leading questions or other objections would by the judge, then that videotape would be dealt with introduced at the trial of the defendant, and if. defendant wants to... the defense counsel wants to cross-examine the child, that cross-examination would place by way of closed circuit TV. The purpose of take this Bill is to reduce the trauma to the child of anina through the court process. Typically, the only witness in these crimes is the child, and the child becomes a victim a second time by the court process because the court intimidating, so frightening to this child, that he or she cannot cooperate, and if he or she does not testify. the bad guy, or the bad woman, the defendant ends up taking a walk and is free to abuse somebody else's children. that has this type of legislation, and certainly there are a number of states that do, our Bill is ... law is based on the Texas experience. They have found that

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

in about 50% of the cases, the defendant, after seeing this videotaped statement. pleads quilty. In those cases the child need not ever be cross-examined because there is a plea that's entered and the child in those 50% of auiltv the cases is saved the trauma of cross-examination. other hand, the... in all cases, when the videotape is there need not be as frequently a telling and retelling of the intimate details of the sexual assault todav. is necessary. It was stated at some of the that. hearings that I attended that right DOM. prosecutorical process, a child has to tell and retell all those intimate details some six to twelve separate times to different... in different prosecutors, different investigators. and children can't go through that and a child's parents simply won't let that child go through So the accused, who mav well have been quilty, ends up walk. taking I \* d bе glad to answer any of questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 510. And on that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

you, Madam Speaker and People of the House. Regan: "Thank T \* d like to just say one quick thing, that I need I have three young children, two 5 year olds and a 6 year old sodomized. Medical evidence. I • ve alreadv told this story six and seven and eight times. They're not even anywhere close to a court trial and thic story has had to be repeated that many times. Let's get it out of here again, and I've got a meeting, Lee and I, with the Governor, tomorrow."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Hill, Representative Van

Van Duyne: "I move the previous question."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "That's not necessary, Representative."

Van Duyne: "Well, let me do it anyway, will you?"

Speaker Breslin: "The guestion is "Shall House Bill 510... The question is, 'Shall House Bill 510 pass?' 411 those vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen and Representative Preston. I regret to advise VOU that Representative Preston has one more Bill. Did you say you wanted to table this Bill. Representative? No. It's House Bill 549, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 549, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

"Thank you. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Houses This is one of those merely very simple Bills. What House Bill 549 does, is to permit judges to... when a child is in a foster home situation, right now, a judge is able to order certain health care that that child needs, the statute is not expansive enough to meet certain If a child is in need of a visiting nurse. present statute does not permit the judge to order, to permit the child to see a visiting nurse or to certain types of therapy and that's all this Bill... it simply expands the already existing authority of that judge types of substitute to order a child in foster or other care to have certain medical help."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the passage of House Bill 549. And on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Hallock: "Yes. Hould the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hallock: "I'd like to, as I did on the previous order, repeat my question as to how it was that you kept these Bills from getting squeezed down into one Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock, as in the previous order, I have to remind you that the rules provide that you must address the subject matter of the Bill on Third Reading. Do you have any substantive questions of the sponsor or would you like to address the Bill?"

Hallock: "Yes. What... what my... yes, I do. My point is, I guess, this is a special order of Lee Preston Bills and they're all fine Bills, but we on the Republican side had many Bills which were urged to be consolidated or defeated. We didn't have any choice, and unfortunately we lost a lot of good Bills this way. Whereas we've been debating his fine Bills today, all good Bills for the most part, but yet he's had them individually. We didn't have that choice, Madam Speaker, and I don't think it was fair."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Olson: "Looking at this outstanding piece of legislation,
Representative Preston, would the cost be borne by the
county in the circuit by which the judge would make this
recommendation for medical, dental or surgical procedures?

Who would pick up... who would bear the financial burden?"

Preston: "Representative, first of all, this Bill doesn't do all those things. Most of what you just said is existing law.

This Bill only expands the existing law that permits a judge to send a child to a physician or dental care to include some other appropriate health care providers. And it would be paid for after this becomes law, the same way

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

it is today, and I'd be lying to you if I told you I knew exactly how that's done."

Olson: "In all probability it would be picked up by an order of the court to the..."

Preston: "It would probably be paid.... "

Olson: "... to the jurisdiction in which the youngster lived."

Preston: "It would probably be picked up by the county, that's right. But the additional cost here is very negligible. That's not... it's very negligible. Right now, in fact, it might even be less cost than there is today, because today the judge can't order this child to have visiting nurse services, so the child would be sent to a hospital today on a daily basis, which would be much more expensive."

Olson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 549 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 679, Representative Black. Clerk, read the 3ill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 679, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The secret is that Mr. Preston and I both have mustaches. If you want your Bills called, you're going to have to grow a mustache. Politics has nothing to do with it. House Bill 679 simply tries to address a situation that we find a little difficult in downstate. We are finding some difficulty in finding day care services, particularly in rural areas.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Now, we're not large enough to have day care centers as you know it, so what the ... what this Bill attempts to do is to add a definition of group day care home to the Child Care All we are changing is as follows: the current law Act. says that day care homes are defined as family homes caring for more than three, but less than eight children, for less than 24 hours a day. All this Bill does is to say: family home which receives more than three, up to a maximum of twelve children. The number includes only the family's natural or adopted children under the age of twelve. Be more than happy to answer any questions. Hould urge your favorable consideration of House Bill 679.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of

  House Bill 679. And on that question, the Gentleman from

  Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I°d like to congratulate Representative Black for being the only Republican to sponsor a Bill that actually helps children."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
  Bowman."
- Bowman: "Well thank you. Madam Speaker. Actually. the Bi11 doesn't help children. I stand in opposition to the Bill. The problem is that twelve kids is an awful lot of kids tο care for with one caretaker. You've all heard about the old woman who lived in the shoe, she had so many kids didn't know what to do. Hell, the problem is, I don't know how many people in this House have as many as twelve kids. but I suspect that nobody here does, and those of you who have more than one child know how difficult it is to keep track of them all. I really think that, in all deference to the problem that Representative 3lack is trying to address, and I understand it's a real problem, I think this is the wrong way to go about it, and I would oppose the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."
- "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of Ryder: Bill. The problem that we have downstate is that it's either we're going to have these children cared someone that has the competence and the ability to take care of them, or they're latchkey kids. They're not being taken care of by anyone. So to stand up and say twelve is too many is not responsive to the facts that downstate. T commend Representative Black on doing something that is positive, that is good, to help take care of these kids. It's a good Bill that addresses a problem I have in my district, he has in his district, and I strongly urge that we pass the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative
- Curran: #Thank you . Madam Speaker. I also rise in support of Representative Black's legislation. You see, I don't think twelve kids in a family is that many. My Mom and Dad took care of 13 for an awful long number of years. I know it can be done and I know that when you get to take the 8:00 in the morning and leave them off at children in at 5:00 in the afternoon, you can do it. Representative Black's... but seriously, Representative Black's Bill does important downstate problem. Bowman probably wouldn't see it that way, Representative but doesn't know how things are in Representative district, or in my district, and I want to commend the Gentleman for a good piece of legislation and rise in support of House Bill 679.™
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sutker."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Sutker: "Madam Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Sutker: "Representative 3lack, is it your intention in the Bill to have only one caretaker in the household providing the service to the twelve children?"

Black: "Representative, a very good question, and as we discussed at some length in Committee, the Department of Children and Family Services will promulgate standards that will have to be met and their standards may very well indicate, as I think they said in that Committee, that no, it will not be just one. But I can't give you an absolute answer to that. All I know is the Department has said they will promulgate standards that will certainly satisfy your concerns as well as everybody else's concerns. I'm sorry that I can't give you a definitive answer to your question."

Sutker: "So... so your Bill provides, at this time, that the

Department will set forth standards as to the number of

people in oversight over the twelve children and there is

flexibility in your Bill that that can occur and will

occur."

Black: "Absolutely, Representative, yes, indeed."

Sutker: "Well, to the Bill, then... "

Speaker Breslin: "Proceedo"

Sutker: "... Madam Speaker. This Bill does address a problem.

As Representative Black knows, there is concern that it may put a tremendous burden on the caretaker who provides the service to these children, but with the understanding that the Department, which is sensitive to the need of oversight, will promulgate rules which will provide for an additional person or persons. I would support this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Black to close."
- Black: "Thank vou verv much. Madam Speaker. think Representative Curran put it in good perspective. Wе must very careful that we don't create a problem of latchkey children in our elementary schools in rural attempt to solve a problem that. I think, we've done. again would emphasize what Representative Sutker said, the Department will promulgate standards. They have told me, in fact, that standards may very well be more difficult what we would like to see, but they will set them nonetheless. I ask for your favorable consideration of House Bill 679."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 679 pass?"

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Representative Satterthwaite, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Satterthwaite, one minute."
- Satterthwaite: "Perhaps the Sponsor can somehow, in explanation of vote, answer the question as to whether the rules that can be promulgated also relate to the ages of the children who will be served in this program. I'm concerned that taking care of twelve one-year olds is significantly different from caring for a variety of ages of children."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

  Johnson. One minute to explain your vote."
- Johnson: "Well sometimes, when we go back in the district, I
  guess all the time, we hear from constituents about what
  the problems of our district are, and Representative Black
  and I, serving very similar districts, have had, and I

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

actually was involved in drafting this legislation with Representative Black to begin with, some constituents who cared, people who want to provide services in rural areas to children, and they care. And this legislation is like more legislation ought to be, and that is responsive to the needs of the people who send us down here. This is good, sound legislation. It makes sense. It in no way endangers the children of the state, and what it means, I think, in the long run, is the ability to provide more services for the children of the state. I join with Representative Black and the others in supporting this Bill and hope that we get a... an affirmative Roll Call."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and 11 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 726, Representative McNamara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 726, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Intergovernmental Missing Child Recovery Act. Third
  Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 726 authorizes I SEARCH units to conduct aimed at preventing children from runaways, and it also authorizes the I SEARCH boards appoint public members. And this Bill. what it does in reality, is allow a networking of I SEARCH, so that i f people can get together, resolve problems, talk about it, it brings in local control as well. It is supported by the Illinois Associations of Chiefs of Police, and I believe also, the State Police. I know of no opposition. I urge its approval."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 726 -And on that question. is there any Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall discussion? House Bill 726 pass?\* All those in favor vote \*aye\*, all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 110 voting record. and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having voting 'no' received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 819, Representative Flowers. passed. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 819, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 819 creates the Drug Free School Law within School Code。 It provides for the creation of a State and School Advisory Committee. Local Drug Free provides for the establishment of a grant program administered by the State Board of Education, and 1 would urge your 'aye' vote regarding House Bill 819, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 819. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 819 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Voting is open. Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. who wish? Πn there are 69 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no' and 1 auestion. voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 946, Representative McNamara. Clerk, read the
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 946, a Bill for an Act to amend the Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Act. Third Reading of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This amends the Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Act and provides for the establishment and maintenance of two statewide toll free telephone numbers by the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, and it provides that the Department, in conjunction with the establishment of the telephone numbers, produce and actively market television, radio announcements and billboard advertising using the theme
\*Orug Usage Addiction is a Crippling Disease\*."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House
Bill 946. And on that question, is there any discussion?
Hearing none, the question is... the Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative McCracken, on the Bill."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McCracken: "Our information indicates that DASA estimates the cost associated with the implementation of this Bill to be 3.3 million dollars. Is that correct?"

McNamara: "I believe your information is incorrect. The note, the fiscal note that was filed with the Bill, indicated \$265,000.00."

McCracken: "\$265,000.00?"

McNamara: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall House Bill 946 pass?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting "aye", 11 voting "no" and none voting "present". This Bill, having received the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 973, Representative DeJaegher. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 973, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the adoption of persons. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Finally. You're going to like me because this is going to be rather brief. House Ri11 973 puts into law basically what Rule 333 does. This is a rule that basically, that 973 has been working The Department of Children and Family Services supportive of this Bill. In fact, I know of no opposition to 973 in its present form, and for this, I hope that all of you will be supportive of 973."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 973. And on that question, is there discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall 973 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'ave', those Voting is open. opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'ave', voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1424, Representative Morrow. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Madam. The House Bill 1424 would require each child care center, maternity center, day care center, and group home to have a person licensed in CPR and the Hemlock (sic — Heimlich) Method. I would urge a "aye" vote. Thank you."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House 9111 1424. And on that question, is there Hearing none, the question is. discussion? \*Shall House Bill 1424 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 114 voting record. \*00\* and none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 1469, Representative Curran. Clerk, passed. read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1469, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to family preservation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran. The Gentleman asks
  leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading
  for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave?
  Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Are there
  any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment &2, offered by Representative

  Curran."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 establishes the
  Emergency Assistance Fund to be used for the obvious
  purposes and I move for the adoption of the Amendment,
  Floor #22."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption ٥f Amendment 32 to House Bill 1469. And on that guestion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the auestion Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?\* All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Chair the Are there any further Amendments?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk. Representative Curran indicates that there should have been an Amendment @1. Would you ďο a search for Amendment #1, please. Return this Bill to the Order of... does the Gentleman have leave to return Bi 11 the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of adopting Amendment #1 which the Clerk's Office overlooked? objection, the Gentleman has leave. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Curran is the Sponsor of Amendment #1. Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had misspoken in the event that we are now working on Floor Amendment \$1. Floor Amendment #1 does what I thought Amendment #2 did. It establishes the Emergency Assistance Fund."

Speaker Breslin: "I see. The Gentleman has asked for the adoption of Amendment 31 to House Bill 1469. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Is this aid on an economic need basis?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran?"

McCracken: "I'm sorry, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Curran: "Yes. It is."

McCracken: "And is that defined?"

Curran: "It is defined. Tom, as those families which are in economic crisis. It is an Amendment where such assistance is not available through other private or public sources.

It's an Amendment brought to us by the Department."

McCracken: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear that."

Curran: "Okay. I'll go it again. This is an Amendment where the definition of the family would be a family which, in an economic crisis and such assistance is not available

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

through other public or private sources. It simply establishes that fund.  $^{\circ}$ 

McCracken: "In your Amendment #1 it states in part that the

Department shall establish administrative rules specifying

the criteria for determining eligibility for and the amount

and nature of assistance to be provided."

Curran: "Correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Now, how does this differ from the Bill?"

Curran: "It simply... this was not in the Bill. This adds it to the Bill. Adds the Emergency Assistance Fund to the Bill."

McCracken: "Okay. Does this constitute an added expense or cost to implementing the Bill?"

Curran: "It does... it does not. He have no funds associated...

we have no appropriation associated with this fund, Tom,

we're just establishing the fund now in hopes that it... "

McCracken: "That some day you'll be able to appropriate it?"

Curran: "Sure."

McCracken: "Okay. What would your level of appropriation be, if you were to make one?"

Curran: "That would be entirely hypothetical, Tom, I have no reason to pick a number, now, at this point. The Department sometimes finds themselves in need, for example, of giving a family rent so they can stay in a house for a couple more days until the Public Aid check comes, or something like that. It assists families from not being displaced. That's what the intention of the fund would be.

McCracken: "Okay. Are you going to go with Amendment #2 as well?"

Curran: "I am."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment @1 be

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it.

  The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
- Speaker Breslin: "Let the record reflect that while Amendment #2
  was already adopted, the Gentleman made an error in the
  description. So, we will go back to describe Amendment #2
  again. Representative Curran. Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the clarification.

  Amendment #2 phases in the development of the provisions of

  1469 over five years and it also establishes clarification

  about the contracting out for services. I move for the

  adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1469. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Amendment #22 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Curran now asks
  leave for immediate consideration of House Bill 1469 on
  Third Reading, as amended. Are there any objections?
  Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill, Mr.
  Clerk, on Third, as amended."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1469, a Bill for an Act relating to family preservation, amending Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

House. 1469 requires the Department to evaluate whether a child may remain in a home environment with the appropriate preventative or reunification services and to notify families of their entitlement to such services. T t requires the Department to accept for such services any family whose child is at risk of being placed outside the home, and it permits a juvenile detention testimony regarding the... the efforts to prevent placement of minors. Be glad to answer any Amendments."

Speaker areslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of
House Bill 1469. And on that question, the Lady from Kane,
Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Hill the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Deuchler: "Representative Curran, the printout here that I have from LIS includes a fiscal note for 37 million dollars. Could you specify... you spoke, I believe, in regard to one of the Amendments, that this was going to be phased in. Can you give us an indication, for example, of the first year cost for the program over these five years?"

Curran: "Thank you for the question. The way the... the way this legislation is implemented, in the first year it has been agreed by the Department and by the interested parties, that the 3 million dollars that is already in the Department's budget for community based services will be the portion of the budget which applies to the utilization of this Act. So there will be no new money required in FY88 for the implementation of House Bill 1469."

Deuchler: "And the second year of the program?"

Curran: "That will be up to the Department to establish rules in conjunction with the Children's Welfare Advisory Committee, which is established in House Bill 99."

Deuchler: "Well, would you anticipate that the scope of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

program would reach that 37 million dollar figure at some point in the future, or why are we saying... "

Curran: "Sure. It could over five years. Yes, it could."

Deuchler: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Hould the Sponsor vield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Frederick: "Representative Curran, as I understand, the main focus of this Bill is to really preserve the integrity of the family. Is that correct?"

Curran: "That's correct."

Frederick: "And in doing that, are we going to be committed to protect the welfare and the safety of the child above all, even though we do want to return children to their own families as quickly as possible. Do you understand that that see."

Curran: "The welfare and the ... as you understand this Bill to mean, the welfare and the safety of the child is our prime concern, ... "

Frederick: "Yes."

Curran: "...regardless of whether they are returned to their family or not."

Frederick: "Thank you very much."

Curran: "Thank you."

Frederick: "I think this is a Bill, Madam Speaker, and I hope that we got enough green votes to pass it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... the Gentleman from DuPage,

Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I... I thank Representative Curran for his candor. Apparently this is possible to reach 37 million dollars in cost over five years. It's to be administered by DCFS, setting up an

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

emergency assistance fund for the reason that the \$500.00 stipend would keep the family together. Nice ideas. pleasant thoughts, good intentions, but 40 million dollars, in order to create this service. I tell you, I'm just lost for words. He've been sitting back here voting with ideas that sound nice and pretty and now we find ourselves coming up with an idea which is administerd on an economic need basis, but by the Department of Children and Family Why isn't Public Aid doing this? If Public Services. Δid needs 40 million dollars to create the economic safety net, isn't the 40 million dollars going there? If it is... if it is to go there, then why don't we address that as we addressed the authorization Bill? All this Bill does authorize us to later appropriate 40 million dollars. The fact of the matter is, we should be looking at Bill not only for what it authorizes us to do, but for what it calls upon us to consider in the future, and that is funding it. Do not abrogate your responsibility pocketbook as well as to the merits of this Bill. understand the Gentleman's concern. He's done an excellent job in this area. He has seen fit to include Republican Cosponsors, but enough is enough. 40 million Dollars, and it's not needed and it cannot be ignored when you consider the issue. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "I move the previous question, Madam Speaker,"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Curran to close."

Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

First to the comments of the last speaker. House. The last speaker seemed to fall under the apprehension that Bill somehow would be more appropriately handled by the budget of the Department of Public Aid. He's around here for five years. I'm not sure how you could be that far wrong after you've been around here for years, but in fact, we're talking about stabilization of about children staying together families, we're talking with their parents, and we're talking about services being entitled to children who are neglected and abuseda You know, we fill up our prisons, we fill up our mental health institutions with people who, to a large extent, have as children. It is unconscionable for us to stick our heads in the sand any longer on this kind of an issue. Let me tell you, when Representative McCracken referred to the work that has been done on this legislation, let me you who some of the people that we worked with. Нe worked with the Child Care Association, they are in favor o f this legislation. He worked with the Catholic of Illinois. They in favor Conference are this We worked with the National Association for the Prevention of Child Abuse. They are in favor of legislation. We worked with Action for Children in They are in favor of this legislation. Illinois. And Voices for Children and the Children's Defense Fund and the Department of Children and the Governor's Office is in favor of this legislation. I move for a favorable vote on House Bill 1469."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1469 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Representative Parcells, one minute to explain your vote."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I commend the Sponsor of

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

this Bill for the hard work he's done, but this one has too big a price tag. It says this gives us the authorization to later spend this money, but remember this is an entitlement. That means they are entitled and you'll have to authorize it later. I suggest a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've been doing an awful lot of things today on behalf of the family and preservation and all that. I have a kind of a sinking feeling about this kind of legislation. There's a downside on it, I'm afraid. What we're really talking about in many instances, I think, is major intervention by big brother into the family."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, one minute to explain your vote. Remember, this Bill has 68 votes, Sir."
- Bowman: "Well. Right. Just to say that it's a big price tag,
  but it's a big problem. If it weren't such a big problem,
  then maybe we could get off cheap. But it is a big
  problem. We need to deal with it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1546, Representative Braun. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to employer discrimination against child caseworkers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Representative Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, to present House Bill

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

1546."

- Rvder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Bill allows, or requires. that those who House. observe violations of child care laws. those who are employees of those who provide child care and observe violations of those laws, no₩• no longer, under provisions of this Bill, have to fear for their employment. Simply stated. a person may not be dismissed because they attention of the appropriate the authority brought to violations of law while in the employment of the person or organization that cause the problems. It's commonly known as a Whistleblower Act. It is a good piece of legislation without a price tag and I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder has moved for the passage of House Bill 1546. And on that question, is there anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1546 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 1569, Representative Petka. passed read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1569, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Petka. Representative Petka.

  Is this your first Bill. Sir?"
- Petka: "I was able to sneak one through on the Consent Calendar, so I guess you can put an asterisk next to this one."
- Speaker Breslin: "Oh, this is an important one. Proceed, Sir."
- Petka: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1569 is an attempt to conserve some of our resources

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

in the juvenile court system. The hope here is to place term 'neglected minor' to place the environment is injurious to his or her welfare. in a neglected status as opposed to an abused status. Our Juvenile Assistant in Will County suggested that there are instances where parents who are respondents in Court are often willing to admit that the environment that their children are...they are providing their children injurious, but they refuse to admit to the Juvenile Court Petition because they don't want to be referred to as abuse parents. I think the change here may be semantical, but it will be certainly a type of legislation which would permit the Juvenile Court System to function much more expeditiously, so I... "

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1569. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Petka: "Yes."

Cullerton: "So the key to understanding what the Bill does, then, is to understand the difference between how the court treats an abused minor as opposed to how they treat a neglected minor. Is that correct?"

Petka: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "And how does... the current law treats them as an abused minor and you propose that it be changed so that they'll be treated as a neglected minor, is that correct?"

Petka: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "So then what is the difference, then, between how the courts treat an abused minor and a neglected minor?"

Petka: "The procedures and dispositions which are available, Representative, are basically the same; however, we're

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

talking about degrees. Some of the types of abuse that we... where parents would basically be admitting to would be abuse that would deal with torture, with sexual abuse, and rather serious type of ominous criminal actions against individuals, the minors. In an environment we're talking about an environment whose...may be injurious to that particular minor, it may be something which is totally nonrelated to that. What I'm suggesting is, taking out from the abuse category and placing it under neglect. we may have a great deal more respondents Juvenile Court being willing to stipulate to Juvenile Court Petitions which will, basically, expedite the process without, basically... "

- Cullerton: "In other words, you think because they have been branded a 'neglected minor', rather than the more offensive 'abused minor', that perhaps they might be more inclined to... to do what?... to... "
- Petka: "To admit to the Petition as opposed to forcing a trial and being, as you say, branded an abused parent... or abusing parent."
- Cullerton: "I see. Well, I don't recall you having presented a

  Bill before, is that correct?"
- Petka: "As I indicated to the... Madam Speaker, I have not been... on my feet to present a Bill. However, I did have one slip through on the Consent Calendar, so we can place an asterisk next to this one."
- Cullerton: "Well, you're definitely throwing me off. Your previous reputation is just not... is one thing, but these look like good Bills. I don't know what to... I can't say anything against this. Other than the fact that it's his first Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "That's fine. That's fine, then. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1569 pass?' All those in favor vote

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? First Bill. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1969, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1969, a 3ill for an Act to amend an Act to establish training requirements for child welfare workers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As of this point, the Department of Children and Family Services does not have a mandated training program.

DCFS has been in the process of formulating such approved program during the past year, and this Bill, as now amended, is that program. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage οf House Bill 1969. And on that question, is there any Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall discussion? House 1969 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'ave', all those Bill opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 115 voting... record. 115 'ave', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. votina This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2559, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2559, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

House. House Bill 2559 is a product of the Conference of Women Legislators. We have had a lot of testimony and debate on this subject, and as a result, we are asking that the Uniform Code of Corrections be amended to provide a prerelease mother and child reunification program to begin six months prior to the inmate's expected date of release, and continue for six months after release. And this... this affects some of the women that are incarcerated in Dwight, and also some of the women that are incarcerated further downstate in Logan. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Bill 2559. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2559 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Ωn this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. and Gentlemen, we are now going to change the Order of having finished the Order on Children. Rusiness. He're Third going to House Bills Reading. Government Administration, Special Order of Business, appearing on page 4 on your Calendar. The first Bill is House Bill 715, Representative Van Duvne. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 715, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "Speaker, you said we were going back to House Bills

  Third Reading, Government Administration, Have the

  previous three Bills before 715 been taken out of the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

record, or if they ve passed, or where are they?"

Speaker Breslin: "Sir, that was where we stopped and this is the next Bill. 715 is the next Bill on that Order."

McCracken: "That's fine. I don't... I don't mind. I was just

Speaker Breslin: "That's the reason. Representative Van Duyne." "Thank you. Representative McCracken, there is no one Van Duvne: in the room more surprised than me. Ladies and Gentlemen the House. House Bill 715 started out to be a little Bill to help our senior citizens under the Senior Citizens. Act or people who are under 14,000 dollars to get biggest bang for their buck for their heating bills. since that time, it has obtained to a greater stature, and now with the Amendment of Representative Mulcahev and Representative Rea it addresses and other people: the elected Commerce Commission. It's a very important thing to us as far as the residents of the State of Illinois that the situation is rapidly getting to be one of our very blood through finance to pay our utility bills. In the past ten years, our utility rates have gone up at least double, in some cases triple, and beyond our ability to pay them. It's believed by many that the appointment of members of the Illinois Commerce Commission has contributed greatly to that unaffordable situation. We, the Sponsors of House Bill 715 and its Amendments, believe that the case has been made by the Citizens Utility Board as #ell as many of the states in our union that an elected Commerce Commission membership is more conducive to greater concerns of the ratepayers. In fact, it's been documented that in a lot of our states, eleven to be exact, that the people enjoy a significantly less cost for their utilities. Also, the fact that the Illinois Political Action Committee states that after a 1981 study, that these rates average 11

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

percent less than the states who have appointed members. In 1982, the University of Arkansas had another study which that elected members allow lower rates of confirmed this, increase as well as not allowing the companies... the money for construction as ... its cost in advance. Flected members tend to force the company to achieve a higher degree of efficiency and that is basically what House 715 does, or at least, it seeks to achieve. He believe. especially at this time, when the Commonwealth Edison others are seeking another gigantic raise every year for the next five years that the Bill's time has come. Now. there are others, and I don't want to take the time of the House to go on with my dissertation, because there are a number of other people who want to address this. Namely, I presume Representative Hulcahey and Representative Rea and others, and so, I will stop right there and allow them to address the problem... the Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 715. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a couple of questions?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Piel: "Representative, you mentioned an elected Commerce

  Commission. How many Commissioners are going to be under

  your proposal would be under this Bill?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne? Representative Van

  Duyne, to answer the question."
- Van Duyne: "Yes, there will be two members elected from Chicago and one from Cook County, one from the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Judicial Districts, and I believe that makes a total of seven."
- Piel: "So basically, then, what you're saying is this... let me

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

ask you this. In your opinion, is this fair representation of all the ratepayers in the State of Illinois?

Van Duyne: "The Bill, through the Amendment, is designed to reflect the geographical as well as the population, not so much the population as it is the geographical location of our Supreme Court Judges. Now, there has been contentions made by one of the Members on your side of the aisle that there is an imbalance in the Supreme Court Justices, but we take the position that that imbalance is not really improper in the sense that if it were that improper, that there would be already a challenge made to the Judicial Districts."

Piel: "Okay, so basically... basically what... "

Van Duyne: "So... what we feel... we feel that it fairly represents the one man/one vote concept."

Piel: basically, what you're saying, with two from the City of Chicago, technically speaking, many times when elected Commerce Commission we come back with the comment that an elected Commerce Commission- which I necessarily agree with their arguments as far as a viable argument for an elected Commerce Commission— an elected Commerce Commission would help the poor people in the City of Chicago. So in other words, you're saying that for the entire City of Chicago, you're offering two Commissioners. Correct? Just answer my question 'yes' or 'no'. two for the City of Chicago. Thank you. Thank you. □

Van Duyne: "That's basic... basically... "

Piel: "So basically, what we're sitting here and saying is, there's two for the City of Chicago, so that would... each one would equal approximately one million five, and you've got one for suburban Cook, so that would be one Commissioner for two million four. I don't exactly figure out where you come up with your breakdown, there, but...

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

That's not a question, it's a comment, Representative. So, you're coming up with a figure of... one Commissioner for suburban Cook, which is, as I say, two million, two million four, somewhere in that area there, and you've got one for one million five in the City of Chicago. Let's move to another part of the Bill. The original Bill, your Amendment now incorporates that with the original Bill, and that deals with people 65 years or older. Correct? Okay. For the record, you should have said 'yes'."

Van Duyne: "For the record... For the record, yes, that's right."

Piel: "Okay. Now, would you explain what that does?"

- Van Duyne: "We have a existing situation through the Federal Government where they do have energy audits made by the appropriate people to find out whether or not our citizens are getting, as I use the vernacular, the biggest bang for their buck. In other words, whether the heat is going out the sides of the house, through the roof or whatever, and it does... it does say that the companies pay into the fund which finances the energy audit, and that's back in the Bill."
- Piel: "Okay, the energy audit's back in the Bill. What is the approximate cost per energy audit?"
- Van Duyne: "It has been reputed somewhere between 15 and 70 dollars. We take the view that it's 15 dollars... as more appropriate."
- Piel: "Alright, 15 to 70 dollars, so anywhere in between the two.

  Approximately how many senior citizen households do we have in the State of Illinois?"

Van Duyne: "Fifteen thousand."

Piel: "Fifteen thousand. Where did you come up with that figure, fifteen thousand senior citizen... no. You're trying to tell me there's fifteen thousand senior citizen households in the State of Illinois?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Van Duyne: "No, I'm not telling you anything. I'm saying... I'm saying strike that. We don't have that... that... available."
- Piel: "Our recorder, by the way, doesn't pick up sign language, so if you'd mind answering. What... Alright... How many homes are there for senior citizens, or how many senior citizens own homes in the State of Illinois? I mean, we've got to find out what this is going to cost the ratepayers in the State of Illinois."
- Van Duyne: "Well, we have... we did not attack this on an accumulative basis. The subject has never been brought up in terms of total concept. They did go through it as per capita or per family or per unit, and it's been ranging anywhere... the staff tells me it's more... closer to 50 dollars."
- Piel: "I'm sorry. What? It's closer to what?"
- Van Duyne: "I'm sorry. I said we don't know, but I'm sorry, I
  embellished on the question."
- "So in other words, you can't answer how many... you're Piel: sitting here saying that it's going to cost anywhere from 15 to 70 dollars per audit for a home that contains a senior citizen, but you can't tell me: one, how many senior citizens we have that own homes in the State of and two, you've got it in the Bill that the rate Illinoisa payers are going to pay it. You can Saves but, LeRoy, I hate to tell you, you and I pay utilities. rates to the public utilities, and if it's a situation that those public utilities are going to end up raising their cost, you and I as ratepayers, our rates are going to go Correct? Or where is the money going to come from?"

Van Duyne: "Conceivably, it does, yes."

Piel: "So in other words, what you're saying is that... "

Van Duyne: "But there... I can't give you the proper name for the

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- fund, but there is a fund established for that very purpose, and... "
- Piel: "Each utility has this fund?"
- Van Duyne: "And until you brought up the subject, it has been deemed enough."
- Piel: "Each utility has this fund for these audits?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel. Representative Piel, your time is up. Hould you bring your remarks to a close, please?"
- Piel: "Madam Speaker, I would wonder if I... somebody on our side

  of the aisle would yield their time to me."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens has indicated he would yield his time to you. Proceed."
- Piel: "Thank you, Representative. Hould you answer my question now, Representative Van Duyne?"
- Van Duyne: "Hould you restate the question, please?"
- Piel: "I'm asking you why you made the comment that they have funds to cover this. I would like to know, do every public utility..."
- Van Duyne: "Ar. Piel. Representative Piel, I do not have..."
- Piel: "LeRoy, this is three times that you've made comments."
- Van Duyne: "I do not have the information right here at my disposal, but in my investigation and the background of the Bill, I am sure that there is a fund established for these through the companies themselves, and you are right..."
- Piel: "Of course, you're guessing... you're guessing that there's this fund."
- Van Duyne: "And you are right when you say that it would be conceivably put into the rate base, that the companies would have to pay this, and therefore they would probably say, justifiably, that we have to get more money in order to pay these..."
- Piel: "You're guessing, then, that there's a fund. You're hoping

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

that there's a fund."

Van Duyne: "No, I'm not. No, I'm not."

- Piel: "Because otherwise, you and I, as ratepayers, are going to end up paying higher utility rates. Right?"
- Van Duyne: "I am not saying that the fund was established for this particular Bill. I am trying to tailor the Bill to tap that fund. It's a..."
- Piel: "Well, you know, I could understand if you were having problems with the amendment that you put on for the elected Commerce Commission and didn't understand that, but you are the Sponsor of the Bill, and this is the original Bill that I'm talking about. I'm not talking about the amendment dealing with the elected Commerce Commission. Let's go back to the elected Commerce Commission for a couple of quick seconds, here. Alright, the elected Commerce Commission. How many states now have them?"

Van Duyne: "Eleven."

- Piel: "Eleven. Has there been a remarkable rate of decrease in .

  utility rates in these states?"
- Van Duyne: "The material that I have states that both numbers are exactly the same. There are eleven states that have it, and the overall rates are eleven percent lower than the ones that have appointed members."
- Piel: "So, in other words, what you want to basically do, it's not necessarily, and I hear this big argument many, many times, that the elected Commerce Commission will bring down rates for utilities. So, it's not basically that, but what you want to do is make the Commerce Commission political. If you make it elected, you're making it political."
- Van Duyne: "He want... He want to make the people on the Illinois

  Commerce Commission responsive and responsible to the

  people, so that the people have direct recourse to these

  people. We feel, and we always have felt, that when you

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

are appointed, you are only responsible and responsive to the man that appoints you. He want this man, if I can coin the phrase that way, to be the people. He have tried to put this in as much... in a proper form that... as a one man federal vote... the federal ruling that it has to be one man/one vote."

Piel: "Okave"

Van Duyne: "And we felt that the Judicial Districts were... "

Piel: "I've only got two more minutes, LeRoy. Cut it short."

Van Duyne: "The Judicial Districts were responsive to that."

Piel: "Okay. Couple... couple other fine points. Of these states that, where the utility rates have been dropped or held continually, have there been any legal proceedings in these states against the Commerce Commission of that state by the utilities?"

Van Duyne: "Well, I always tell my kids that I didn't get to be
my age by skipping 20 years, so I'm going to apply that
logic to your question, and wherever the rates have dropped
or wherever the rate increases have been denied, I presume
that the companies would have engaged in some kind of
action to try to..."

Piel: "You're presuming. In other words, you don't know the answer for sure. Okay."

Van Duyne: "Hell, you're asking me the question. All I can do is answer."

Piel: "Okay. If... If they have, what type of... what type of verdict has been turned down by the courts?"

Van Duyne: "I don't even know what you mean."

Piel: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Piel: "Ladies and Gentlemen, before you cast an 'aye' vote on this Bill, I hope that you've been listening to the, somewhat, dialogue between the two of us. Just to bring up

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

one final point. First of all, he even stated that whether they are appointed or whether they are elected is not making a difference on utility rates. Time and time again. the people state that they have to have an elected Commerce Commission to lower utility rates. I would like to make two points. One; elected Commerce Commission, political and does not lower the utility rates, and in the states to where the Commerce Commission has been in other words, they've gone in and receptive one bit. they've said, 'We will not allow any type rate ыe will not listen to you at all. gone to court. One hundred percent of the time, case has ever been overturned by the court. The court has ruled with the utility one hundred percent of the time...

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Piel: "Thank vou. One hundred percent of the time that the utilities have been found to be justifiable in Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a process. not a willy-nilly process. For a rate increase or decrease to go through, it's not something that happens overnight. I think the process... It needs to be fine tuned. We do have problems. I'm not saying there are no problems with It."

Speaker Breslin: "Complete your sentence, Sir."

Piel: "When we go into an elected Commerce Commission, it's opening up a Pandora's box, and I would ask for a 'no' vote on House Bill 17... 715."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative

Rea. Representative Greiman in the Chair."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

For more than 15 years in Illinois, the electric and

natural gas costs have been on a steady increase, and it

seems that nothing that the consumers have tried to do have

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

really slowed down the rate of energy price increases, and there seems to be no immediate end to the escalating utility costs. At the... In fact, as we look at the costs customers, residential, utilities, all classes of industrial, commercial, paid much lower rates in elected Commissions than they did in Illinois. rates for residential consumers averaged 24.4 percent more in Illinois than they did in states with elected regulatory hodies. Illinois commercial customer rates were percent higher, and industrial rates 18.6 percent higher... (tape malfunction) than the elected Commission states. Ωn a whole, states in... in states where the appointed bodies were 14.8 percent higher for residential, 13.7 percent for commercial, and 17.1 higher for industrial customers than states with elected Commissions. There are 11 states in that do have the elected Commission, and in those utility rates on the average are at 11 percent lower. We believe that the elected Commission will Members more accessible, more responsive, and Commission actually will have an opportunity that way to hase decisions more based upon the needs than what they are present time. presently doing. Αt the there is not accountability. They are appointed, but then they do not have to really account to anybody. As I look terms of 500 kilowatt hours in our residential rates in neighboring states, I first look at Illinois. it's T look at our neighboring states of Indiana, 42.19; Ohio, 42... no, Hisconsin, 35.82; Kentucky. 31.96: 43.55; Missouri, 37.78. Illinois is the highest of I think that it's time for all of those states. here in Illinois. I think it's time that the people have spoken, and they have said that they would like to have an elected Commission. I feel that this Bill is a good Bill.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

It provides for geographic representation, also, which is VATV because this means, then, Commission members will be accessible. It means that thev be in all parts of the state. It means that we will will have access to them. It means that input can be made process, and as a result, I think that this is a good government Bill, and there is a need for an Commerce Commission. I would ask for your support on this important Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

- Hoffman: "Mr. Sponsor, Mr. Sponsor. Where... where do the...
  where are the lowest residential rates... where do the
  lowest residential rates in the country... where are the
  residential rates in the country that are the lowest in
  effect?"
- Van Duyne: "If I can answer you in a... sort of an awkward form,
  I will just tell you that we are not concerned. We would be
  very interested in finding that out, but the fact of the
  matter is that we are one of the highest, if not the
  highest, and that's what concerns us."
- Hoffman: "Hould you be surprised to find out that the lowest rates... the lowest residential rates exist in Idaho, Oregon and Hashington? Hould you be surprised to find that I can tell. You're not surprised. You're not surprised. It might surprise you to know. however. that those states have appointed Commissions. all three o f You're suggesting that the way a Commerce Commission is structured is going to have some impact on the rates. The truth of the matter is that other factors. other besides whether the Commerce Commission is elected or appointed, affect what happens to the rates, and regardless

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

of whether thev're elected or appointed. if they individuals, they have to take a look at the responsible Those choices were made by evidence and make some choices. elected and appointed Commissions across the country on the basis of the evidence and the circumstances that exist, not the method in which they were chosen. However. in states that has an elected Commerce Commission, they don't even make a decision. Everything ends up in the court, and the Judge makes the decision, and in that state, that state, practically all of the cases taken to court are won on their face by the utilities that are requesting the rate increase against their... against their particular cost. The truth of the matter is. Ladies and Gentlemen. if vou\*11 look at the history of the Commerce Commission in Illinois under both parties, under Republican and under Democrat Governors, the decision to place people... "

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Hoffman: "... Decision to make those appointments have been done in the best interest of the general public, and I rise in opposition to this... to the Gentleman's legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Hr. Matijevich."

Mati ievich: Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I "Hr. hesitate to rise because I know we all know how we're going to vote, but I want to remind everybody to let you know how the people want you to vote, and I rise in total support of LeRoy Van Duvne's Bill as it is now amended to have an elected Commerce Commission. The issue is, are you or are the people happy with the Illinois Commerce Commission? And I think there is a resounding 'no' to that. I've often on the floor of this House, 'If it ain't said broke, don't fix it. you Now, you ask the people who represent if they think the Illinois Commerce Commission isn't broke. If it isn't broke, it is seriously damaged.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

ought to do to the Illinois Commerce Commission — pass this out of here, pass it out of the Senate, put it on the Governor's desk, and then let's see if they have a rate increase."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Ackerman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the on House. The information that CUB put out rankings does not show any correlation between elected and appointed Commerce Commissions, rather, it shows the differential is caused by the proximity to their power supply and type of power used, such as hydroelectric versus nuclear or coal. The main result of an elected Commerce Commission would be to shift rates and further erode the Illinois business climate. I don't believe the business climate deserves this kind of a blow at this time. The other effect, I'm afraid, would be creating a bunch of Pat clone... Pat Quinn clones running around the state. running this Commerce Commission, and I certainly don't think I oppose this Bill." we need that.

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Hembers of the House. Notwithstanding Pat Quinn, ever since 1975 when I came to this General Assembly, I have been trying to do something far as the Illinois Commerce Commission is concerned. About five years after that, I was burned out for a couple of years, but we picked up and we continued all over again. You know, the greatest pain to human nature is the pain of a new idea, and this, indeed, is a new idea, and Ŧ think a new idea that's going to work. If you look at some of the statistics, rate increases granted Illinois gas electric utilities totalled 3.9 billion dollars from 1977 through 1985, the years that I've tried to go to an elected Commerce Commission. In 1985, Illinois energy utilities

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the people in your district whether they believe the last 10 years with the highest increases in utility rates in the history of Illinois means that they think the Illinois Commerce Commission is operating effectively. efficiently. and mainly, are they operating fairly. you ask the people in your district if they believe that when members of the Illinois Commerce Commission or people in high staff positions. when they leave the Commerce Commission, they strangely become employed in the public If that isn't an indication of how the Illinois utilities. Commerce Commission has weighed in favor of the public utilities, and if they think that that's fair. And I also said on Second Reading, if no other reason than to give the message to the Illinois Commerce Commission that haven't been operating fairly to the consumers, that we ought to give them that message, because we away some powers from the Citizens' Utility Board. It's the only thing we have going for us, and surely, we've got to. now. show that message again. And I alluded also Second Reading, to the present rate proposal before the Commerce Commission. You know. somebody this morning talked about the CUBs and said something about the 'June Hell, let me tell you, we adjourn this House June 30th. and the 'July Surprise' is a rate They wait until the first week in July. render a rate increase. That is the surprise to the Now, there is pending, right now, ratepavers. vou five vear. what thev call a rate freeze, but it's going to be a rate increase for the next five Ιt isn't such a big deal, and you know, there are some states, because of the windfall in the Federal Tax Reform Act, that are reducing rates. Here in Illinois, we're going to get a rate increase. Big surprise. Hell, I'll tell you what we

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

received an average of 92.5 percent of their requested increases from the Illinois Commerce Commission. No accountability whatsoever, at least on paper. National energy utilities received only 38 percent of their request. In 1985, one out of every four dollars granted - 26 percent in energy utility rate hikes in the country to Illinois ratepayers. And finally, in 1985, Illinois electric rates ranked the highest here in the Midwest. This may not. indeed. be a perfect idea. but I think it's time for a change. There are people such as my parents and your parents around this country who have been taught all of their life that you pay your bills before you go to the grocery store and before you buy food, and the people ٥f this State who are on pensions, who are on fixed incomes and who can't help themselves, not because they don't but because they can't, are the ones who are being stuck with these ridiculously high rates. They put you summer programs and they take you off summer programs. They time payments and they take you off time and they think they\*re doing you a favor. They're not doing you a favor. And as Representative Matijevich pointed out, indeed, the people of the State of an elected Commerce Commission. Illinois want to go to They've been... They've been robbed long enough system we have. It's time for a change, and it's time for a change now, and I ask you to vote \*aye\* on particular Bill. We've been working for a long, long time. stand up and represent those 100,000 people that we represent in Springfield, and adhere to their wishes. Let's vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I might need to have a deferral on time here, so I

guess I'll do that after five minutes. Representative Van

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Duyne, how many of the Members of the Commerce Commission can you name for me? Can you name all the Members of the Commerce Commission? Do you know them?"

- Van Duyne: "I don't even think that's relevant to the issue. It

  doesn't... their product that they put out is more relevant
  than their names. Can you name them, by the way?"
- Johnson: "Do you know... How many of the six candidates for the

  Board of Trustees in the last election can you name for

  me?"

Van Duyne: "You know, Mr. Speaker." Ar. Speaker."

- Johnson: "Let me... Let me ask you in addition... obviously, don\*t know... tell me what the factors that go into the determination by the Illinois Commerce Commission of a rate What statutory and increase are now. administrative factors does the Commerce Commission have to consider in determining whether to grant or not grant rate increases or to modify it, and if those factors are whatever they does this Bill of yours, in addition to making the Commerce Commission elective, change the factors that go into the determination of rate increases?"
- Van Duyne: "None whatsoever. It just changes their conscience and who they have to be responsive to. When I have to go back and talk to the Governor, I have to listen to him, and when I have to go stand for reelection, I don't care what the Governor thinks, I worry about what my people back home, and you should be doing the same thing, and I'm sure you do."
- Johnson: "You're concerned, are you not, just as a general proposition about maximizing the responsiveness of the... of the political system... or the governmental system to the will of the people. Isn't that right?"

Van Duyne: "That's right."

Johnson: "And you want to maximize in every case, don't you, the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

amount of input that the citizens have in the various decisions we make at all levels of government. Is that right?"

Van Duyne: "I think that would be desirable, yes."

Johnson: "Why is it that on page 29 and 30 of House Bill 2034, you offered an Amendment, that I guess was adopted, that would remove the ability of the people to vote on Port Authority expansion, construction, development, and so forth. Take away the referendum rights. Why did you do that?"

Van Duyne: "I don't even know what you're talking about, but it has no bearing on..."

Johnson: "Hell, I'll tell you specifically what I'm talking about is, Amendment 03...."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Johnson put the question, and Hr. Van Duyne has the opportunity to answer the question. Mr. Van Duyne. Is there a question pending, Mr. Johnson? Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: ™The question was... he didn't know what I was referring to, so I want to elaborate on the question."

Speaker Greiman: "Put the question, Sir."

Johnson: "My point is that amendment #3 to House Bill 2034 on pages 29 and 30, that amendment that's sponsored by the Sponsor of this Bill would remove the ability of the voters to vote in a referendum on construction, development and so forth, of the Port Authority in Joliet. Why do you want to do that?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, that has no bearing on this Bill."

Johnson: "It has to do... "

Van Duyne: "And the... "

Johnson: "It has to do... "

Van Duyne: "And the Members of this Body have been admonished by..."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with the intention of the Sponsor..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Yes."
- Van Duyne: "And the Members of this Body have been admonished
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Johnson, you asked a question. Mr. Van Duyne is responding. Now, you may not enjoy his response, but let's listen to what he says."
- Johnson: "Oh, I enjoy it a lot. I'd like to hear it further."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. And it doesn't have to be one that you like. Mr. Van Duyne for a response."
- Van Duyne: "By the way, for his satisfaction, that Bill... that

  Amendment was withdrawn by me."
- Johnson: "Well, you offered it."
- Van Duyne: "So it's not... And it has nothing to do with this

  Bill."
- Johnson: "Okay, let me ask further, then. Does this Bill have anything to do, Representative Van Duyne, with changing in anyway, the qualifications that are necessary before somebody can serve on the Commerce Commission?"
- Van Duyne: "Yes, they must be elected."
- Johnson: "Well, aside from the fact that they're elected, does it change the necessity of background, education, experience..."
- Van Duyne: "They have to have the same qualifications that you have to have to be Governor or a State Representative."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Johnson, bring your remarks... 48 seconds to go on this."
- Johnson: "I guess the answer is 'no', it doesn't change the qualifications. Okay then, I would ask Representative... for somebody to yield their time so I could have a little

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

bit more time to ... "

Van Duyne: "Don't forget to keep marking up who's yielding their time."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Parke, did you wish to yield your time to Mr. Johnson?"

Parke: "That was very astute of you, Mr. Speaker. Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Is there contained anywhere in this legislation, this authorizing in legislation, any prohibitions or limitations on how much money public utilities, corporations, labor unions or anyone else can give to candidates who run for the Commerce Commission? Or do you intend to propose any such limitations?"

Van Duyne: "Mr... Representative Johnson, we've matched this Bill
to the stringent rules as applied to State
Representatives..."

Johnson: "Okay, what limitations would there be on how much money

Illinois Power could give..."

Van Duvne: "There are none."

Johnson: "... Or Champaign county health care consumers could give to a candidate? What are the limitations, what are the stringent limitations that you're talking about? The fact of the matter is. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there aren't any limitations now addressing There aren't any limitations whatever. All we're going to do is, in the name of telling voters that we're going to do something about utility rates, enact an absolutely fallacious piece of legislation that's going do nothing whatever. It doesn't change the qualifications for a membership in the Commerce Commission, it doesn't change the ability of the citizens and various interest groups to affect the votes of Commerce Commissioners. As a matter of fact, it opens up the process far more than the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

current process does to buy-outs by various interest groups who can directly affect rates. It does nothing about rates. It does nothing about changing the factors that go into the determination of rates by the Commerce Commission, and what it does is clearly fly in the face of \*Baker If you live in the Second Suburban Cook, if you live in the Second Judicial District, you're going to be vastly underrepresented because the population variances are up to 53 percent from the norm and clearly unconstitutional. I want to do something rate increases, too. I don't like to see it any more than anybody else does, but simply waving this panacea. or alleged panacea at the people and saying because we're going to elect your Commissioners that it's going to your rates go down, just flatly isn't the case. We need to have some substantive approach to the issue. He need to approach the reason why rates have gone up, to wave out this red flag in front of the people and then expect them to say you did something about it, the fact of the matter is, if we did make this change, we'd come back here in two or three years when everybody then is subject to the real political system, contributions and everything else, and say, "God, why did rates go up percent rather than they had been before? It's just not a realistic approach to the issue, and I would respectfully request the people vote 'no' on this issue."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House 3ill 715, and I think the issue has been stated very clearly. It's just, who do we want the Commerce Commission to be responsive to, and what are some of the reasons our rates, particularly in northern Illinois, have gone up so high? I'd like to just

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

share with the Body an experience. There is a Commonwealth Edison distribution center located in my district. which is closing. There are three distribution centers in shortly, there will only be two-Now. we've met with Verv the people of the utility to find out exactly why they were closing this distribution center, why jobs were and they weren't going anyplace else. total cutdown from three centers to two, and we the reason for the close is because the demand has that. Ladies decreased. t reneat and Gentlemen. Commonwealth Edison is closing distribution centers in Chicago because the demand has decreased. So. T flabbergasted and asked their representatives how could demand be decreasing when we're constantly building new nuclear facilities? They did not have a good answer, but the answer is that they are two separate operations the of the utility that wants to expand, and in reference to Representative Johnson's questions about why the going up, they keep going up because the Commerce Commission recognizes a profit on the excess capacity to the stockholders of the utilities... as a legitimate part of the rate base that our senior citizens, who can't afford electricity, who, in Chicago, if Representative Huff was here, he'd say, 'They have to make a choice in winter between heating and eating. Now. I don\*t know elected Commerce Commission is going to solve this problem, with the appointed system we have, we have the highest rates in the midwest while we pay for excess capacity at a time when demand is going down. Now, I don't know what anyone else's constituents feel about the matter. but my constituents would like to have a little more hands-on conversation and interplay with the people who set the rates and make decisions to include profits for excess

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

capacity at a time when demand is going down. This is a good Bill, it's a necessary Bill, it's a consumer Bill. A vote for this Bill shows your consumers, shows your low income constituents, shows your senior citizens that you do, in fact, share their concerns..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Young: "... Over these outrageous, ridiculous rate increases that
we've encountered for the last 10 years. I urge an 'aye'
vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I represent a district that is severely impacted by utility rates and, frankly, I'm really concerned about utility rates, and one of the reasons why I've supported a lot of the Citizens \* Utility Board legislation. matter of fact, Representative Matijevich passed out a Bill, I believe yesterday, by an overwhelming margin, House Bill 401, which would allow the Citizens' Utility Board checkoff system. I was the Cosponsor of that, probably the only Republican Cosponsor on that particular Bill. But let's not make the mistake, Ladies and Gentlemen, of believing that election is going to bring lower utility rates. If we follow that argument, my friends, then why isn't it that we don't have an elected Chicago School Board? I would suggest that there are a lot of people in the City of Chicago who are not too happy about the way the Chicago Board of Education runs system, and yet, we aren't rushing to the lake and trying to get an elected Chicago School Board. I think that perhaps maybe a lot of people have gripes with the CTA, and an appointed CTA, we don't have an elected yet. we have CTA. We have a major problem with the Chicago Housing Authority, and yet, I don't see this great move and this

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

great effort to make that an elected board. The point fact is, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's not whether or not you're elected, it's... and I may not make the Gentleman on the second floor happy by saying this, it's not the election that makes a good board, it's the people on that board, and the people that are appointed to that Let's work harder at making sure that the people who are appointed to that board, apart from the policital process. the people that are appointed to that board are responsive and do the right thing. I urge a \*no\* this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran."

"Thank you, Mr. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Curran: Speaker. I think we have tended to miss the point. Fach one of us sits or stands in this room because somebody chosen to elect us to this position, and I would imagine that each of us would be willing to say of the electors that those people are able intelligent decision. Otherwise, why are you here? they can make an intelligent decision to put you here. can these same intelligent people not make an intelligent decision to put good members of the Commerce Commission ₩hat's really going on here is, we're protecting here? somebody's rear end, aren't we? He're circling the wagons, aren't we? What we really should be doing is saying the voters in our districts who have shown the intelligence to elect us, have the same intelligence to elect other good elective office. If you say that your voters people to cannot elect good people, then vote against this, but i f you say that your electors can elect good people, then vote or otherwise you insult the elective voters of your district."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Hell, Mr. McAuliffe, there are only two people that are seeking... who are seeking recognition. Mr. Hannig, from Macoupin. With leave, let's let them both express themselves. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Hembers of the House. one of the Gentlemen on that side of the aisle ask. do WP know any of the Members of the Commerce Commission? And I think that's one of the interesting questions we look I don't know any of the Members of the Commerce today. Commission. I've never met them, and I don't think thev really take any interest in our constituencies or the problems that the people in our districts face. Mhat this attempts to do is to give the people of our districts in the State of Illinois an opportunity to see when they're candidates for office, come to the small towns in rural Illinois, come to Chicago, come to the suburban areas and talk about the problems that the utility companies face and that we as consumers face, and tell us a little bit about what they would do if they were elected to the Commerce Commission. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. Every two years, we face an opponent who wants to talk about the issues and perhaps point out the problems that we've had on our votes on the House floor, and I think that's a very legitimate type of debate. So, I would simply say that we need to bring a little democracy, a little accountability into the process to give the people of our districts a chance to see these people, to meet these people, to ask them what they're about what they want to do if they re elected to the Commerce Commission. You know, John Matijevich said if it broke, don't fix it. I would simply say, if we don't fix

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

this system, we're all going to be broke."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had an old football coach, a very wise and learned man, who told me some time ago, in fact, he hailed, I think, from Durand, who gave me a definition of the And he said, 'Bill, the definition of the word \*dilemma\* is when you have a question and neither answer is entirely satisfactory to you.\* And I feel that I'm in that position, and with all due respect to Representative Matijevich, I haven't made up my mind how I'm going to vote on this issue at this particular point in time. I know the reason behind the move. I have two teenage children. think they have a stereo or something that resembles stereo in every room of the house, and I pay utility bills, with two teenage children, I'm on budget billing. But let me ask if the Sponsor would yield some auestions. I know the main reason for the push to an elected Commerce Commission. and that is higher rates. rates that we're all paying, those in this chamber and those that we represent. Representative, can you give me any assurance that the factors that are causing the higher utility rates are caused vis-a-vis an appointed Commerce Commission versus an elected Commerce Commission. are they due to circumstances that perhaps are not under either control?

Van Duyne: "Yes. Yes, in fact, we have already ennumerated all of those, and I'll do it one more time for you. It will save me, in my summation, reiterating the same thing. In Illinois versus the states that have elected Commerce Commissions, the residential consumers paid 25 percent higher rates. The commercial consumers paid an average of 24.3 percent higher rates, and the industrial consumers

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

paid an average of 18.6 percent. Now we do assume that Illinois will be like the average elected states; wherein, they do have these lower rates. and if did He have an elected Commerce Commission. that the people, in their responsiveness to the constituents of Illinois, MOUT d reflect the same initiative that was... in these other states."

- Black: "Thank you, Representative, thank you. ⊌hat T woulds.s I hoped you would address were the cost of coal, the cost of freight, and the cost of building plants that up considerably, and I'm not sure aone that either Commission would address that. One other question. Μv father is retired and lives in Arizona. They have an elected Commerce Commission. I • m concerned that their rates 25 are Same percent higher than ours. Can you address that?"
- Van Duyne: "Hell, the... Arizona has the Salt River Project, and they do have a lot of hydroelectricity, the same as they do in Idaho, so we will... we would probably look badly... look bad in comparison to them, plus the fact that some of their... theirs is publicly sponsored, hence the reference to the Salt River Project, but Illinois has not that comparison."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Bringing my remarks close, can you tell me what the trend is, currently, for an elective versus appointed Commerce Commission? the trend growing, or is the trend, in fact, going the other wav? I ask that question because it seems to me that currently only 11 states elect public service Commissioners; whereas, in 1954 it was 17 states, so perhaps you could address that and clear my mind on Thank you."

Van Duyne: "Yes, yes, I would. You know, this is a highly

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

volatile subject. You have people who have a monopoly on our utilities in practically every state in the union because of the fact that such a...

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr• Van Duyne to finish his response•

  Proceed•"
- Van Duyne: "It's such a large business that these people react violently. They spend millions of dollars to fight issues. 50 i + \* s а very slow growing trend, but nevertheless. i t is а arowing trend. especially in Illinois, because of the excessive rates."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Hill, Mr. Van Duyne, to close."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Batavia. a little community of about four or five... in there is that general area, there's a community of about four five little towns that became so vehemently opposed to Commonwealth Edison's rate increases that they threatened to Wisconsin Power. Chicago is leased... with the Commonwealth Edison is going to run out in Washington has, time and time again, threatened that he is going to go to another state if they don't make some adjustment. I don't see how in the world that anybody, we've given you today, faced with the figures that refute the argument that the Illinois Commerce Commission has not been responsive to the constituents at all. the way, that's who they're supposed to be representing, they're supposed to be representing the public. They have no obligation to make the ... make the decision that the stockholders get an absolute return on their money. He feel that we have presented our case as hard and factually as possible. He've tried very hard to do that. We've tried to get the message to all the people that the Illinois rates were going through the ceiling, and

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

that the increases were... by the Commerce Commission were granted anyway. They have no regard for the contracts for coal. They make excessive contracts for too long a time. They have no insistence on efficiency. All of these things have culminated in the highest rates in the country. He believe that the ICC must start listening to the cries of our constituents, and the only way to accomplish this is to make them stand for election, and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no".

  Voting is open, and this is final action. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner, one minute to explain your vote."
- Turner: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise to explain my vote. I have a lot of Assembly. doubts about this particular Bill. It is not a Bill that I think is in the best form. It is one that I know Governor will have to do something with, but it's a message to be sent to the Commerce Commission. heard in the State of Louisiana where all the former elected Commerce Commissioners or Commissioner Officers have went on and became Governors of that state. T also realize that when you talk about it in the City of Chicago, we could very well elect our Commissioner with little or no money, but outside the City of Chicago, they spend 100 dollars for campaigns. Commissioner's representing, in my mind, the consumer. That's the type of Commissioner we'd like to have in office, but I feel that with 150,000 dollar campaign, he's going to be owned and by the utility company. There's an old song about whose song you shall... whose bread you shall eat is song you shall sing, and I see a big fear in that in terms of electing the Commerce Commission, but I am sending a

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

message, like many of my fellow Democratic Members here today, that something must be done to the utilities in this state. Something must be done to the utilities in this country, and when you have nowhere else to go, I don't care if they're elected or appointed, the rates are not going down, and the question that we have to deal with is how are we going to lower those rates. I say, let's eliminate the Commission, period. Let's give people free utilities."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. One minute, Ma'am."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in previous Sessions, I have supported elected Commerce Commission members because I felt that at that point, the Commerce Commission was broke, but as we said, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it. He fixed it a couple of years ago. just recently given new authority to the individual members the Commerce Commission. We have not yet had time to see what they can do with that additional staff and authority. I believe that we will never know whether that system will work if we start changing it again too soon. Let's give the work that we did to improve the Commerce Commission a chance to function and see whether or it can provide a better system. Currently, there is less control by the Chairman, more individual input, and I think that's what we should test for awhile."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland, one minute to explain your vote."
- Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It looks like we're going to send a message to the Commerce Commission and to the Governor, and if we do, I don't think that's a terribly bad idea. I'd like to explain, though, why I'm going to vote 'no'. I don't think we can compare the election of people to the General Assembly to the election of people to the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Commerce Commission. Most of us who are elected to the General Assembly in the course of running for that office bouncing around a number of special interest groups, and perhaps our abilities are how to nut combinations οf those groups together to adequately represent our constituents. The fact of the matter is, my fear an election ... people running for the Commerce Commission could very much... too much be in the camp of side. The utilities; or the other side, the consumer groups that... "

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. Just finish your remarks, Sir."

Kirkland: "Okay. ...That represent the taxpayers, yes, but perhaps, in some instances, represent simply lowering the rates in all instances as opposed to considering, also, the needs of having adequate ..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Kirkland: "... Electricity and so forth. So, I'm just afraid that the election process for the Commerce Commission would be much different than our election process. I don't think they're the same, and we should vote against the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Levin, one minute to explain your vote.

The timer is on, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the In explaining my 'aye' vote, let me first indicate that the approximately five billion dollars in over the last few years from the Illinois Commerce Commission makes what we have done in terms οf tax increases pale by comparison. So. I think it's verv appropriate for our citizens of this state to have input, since they have an input in terms of what we do down here. As far as the rewrite of the Public Utility Act, we major changes, significant changes which. unfortunately. this Commission has not been paying

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

attention to and has not been following, particularly with respect to this current Commonwealth Edison deal where we made major procedural changes, and they are truncating the proceeding into a very short period of time. They're ignoring the two years of work that we did."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harris, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."
- Harris: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the The harangues we've heard today about how high House. utility rates are really centered on one company in and we know which company that is. That's the largest utility company in this state, and I live in that service district, and I can tell you very well that when they presented their rate increase proposal, they didn't go to the Commerce Commission first, they went to the elected politicians, and it seems to me that if they want to go to the elected politicians, we should give them an Commerce Commission. But, you know the problem with that? It's striking at just one utility company in this and I grant you. they have abused the system. and maybe we should pass this out of here just to get at that utility company, but there are a lot of responsible utility companies, and it's unfortunate that we have that one that doesn't seem to like to abide by the rules and wants to things their own wav. I think prudence dictates that to force this on those that... those utility companies are responsible would be a bad thing, and I think the best vote is a \*no\*•"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Ar. Peterson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my 'no' vote, I

  think we've failed to remember that currently, this General

  Assembly is a major player in the process of selecting

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Commerce Commission members. They are nominated by the Governor, and they are sent to hearings in the Senate, they are approved by the Senate. This process works. T f you're so interested in ICC membership, why don't vou αo the Senate hearings and participate? How many of you have gone over to those meetings? Probably That's why you don't know those members. Hhy don't you talk to your Senators and tell them what you them question the members when they come before the The process that we have now is a good fault lies not with the ICC. it lies with this Legislative Body by not using the power that it has Thank you." currently.

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Morrow, one minute to explain your vote."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to state my possible conflict of interest in this issue. I had planned to vote 'present' on this issue, but I began to give a great deal of thought on this, in as such that I was sent down here by the 32nd District the people of the 32nd District and I don't feel that they would allow me to vote 'present'. So, on this issue, I will vote 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hensel, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Sponsor of the Bill mentioned a little municipality in my district called Batavia. There are a few municipalities in my district that purchase the electricity. They have the option to go out and negotiate where they want to buy their electricity. The best... to my knowledge, the Wisconsin was the cheapest. I think they're negotiating to try to get back into Illinois to buy their electricity. I don't think the Illinois Commerce Commission has anything to do

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- with the rates that they can buy their electricity from, and I don't see where an elected Commerce Commission would do any better, and I vote 'no'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, requests..."
- Johnson: "Verification."
- Speaker Greiman: "Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. The Gentleman from Hill, Mr. Van Duyne, asks a poll of those not voting. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting. Deuchler and Hicks.

  No further."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Black. Braun. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski.

  Capparelli."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Johnson: "Could we start over, so I can see what's going on,
  here? If you could ask people to be in their seats so we
  could have some kind of order, here."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Under our rules, Members should be in their seats during the verification. Proceed with... proceed, Sir."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Black. Braun. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Christensen. Cullerton. Capparellia Curran. Daley. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Goforth. Flowers. Giorgi. Granberg. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Hasara. Homer. Huff. Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. McNamara. Morrow. Mulcahey. O'Connell. Novak.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Panayotovich. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Regan. Rice. Saltsman. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich。 Turner。 Van Duyne。 Heaver. Wennlund. Hhite. Williams. Hilson. Wolf. Anthony Young and Hyvetter Younge."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Johnson, questions of the Affirmative Roll
Call."

Johnson: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Braun. Ms. Braun. Is Ms. Braun in the chamber? Ms. Braun is... Ms. Braun in the chamber? How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Ms. Braun from the Roll Call. Mr. Steczo asks leave to be verified."

Johnson: "That's fine."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay. You have leave."

Johnson: "Representative Homer."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer. Is he in the chamber?

Mr. Homer. How is Mr. Homer recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Homer from the Roll Call. Mr. Homer has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Homer. Ms. Jones and Mr. Preston desire to be verified. Do they have leave?"

Johnson: "Leave."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."

Johnson: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Huff is in the rear of the chambers."

Johnson: "Representative Currie."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie voted 'no'."

Johnson: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Representative Breslin."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Ms. Davis asks leave to be verified."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Johnson: "That's fine. Representative Breslin."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Breslin is at the door."

Johnson: "Representative Giorgia"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giorgi is at his seat."

Johnson: "Representative White."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. White is in the middle aisle."

Johnson: "Representative Brunsvold."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brunsvold is at the rear of the chamber."

Johnson: "Representative Daley."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daley... Representative Daley is at his seat."

Johnson: "Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeLeo is in his seat."

Johnson: "If I could have just a moment, Mr. Speaker. Laurino?"

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. What?"

Johnson: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Laurino. Mr. Laurino is here at the well."

Johnson: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Panayotovich is on the side of the chamber."

Johnson: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hartke. Mr. Hartke is in his new seat."

Johnson: "No more. Well, I guess... Wait a minute, one more.

Yes. Wait a minute. No. I... Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz is right here at the well.... is

voting 'no'. Yes, Mr. Martinez. Vote Mr. Martinez

'ave'."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question... Ar. Dunn. On this

question, Ar. Johnson, do you have any further questions?"

Johnson: "Is... Representative Bugielski. Is he here?"

Speaker Greiman: "He is in his chair, Siro"

Johnson: "Representative Krska. Is Representative Krska here?"

Speaker Greiman: "In his chair."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Johnson: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Greiman: "In his chair."

Johnson: "If I could have just a moment, Mr. Speaker. I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question, there are 63 "aye", 46 "no",
5 voting "present". This Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On
this order of business appears House Bill 724. Mr. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 724, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 724 is a very simple Bill. It requires the consent of existing municipalities to incorporate in areas of city or village if the area is within one and a half miles. The Bill makes the mutual consent required when any area to be incorporated of any population size is within one and a half miles of existing municipal border. Presently, it's 7,500 residents. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, moves for the passage of House Bill 724. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. And this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is now being distributed."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "On this order appears House Bill 842. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 842, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the powers of attorney governing personal and health care matters. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sutker."

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Sutker: House. This. House Bill 842• is an advancement in the law of for agency. Ιt provides an a genc y t٥ survive the disability of the principal that creates it. It provides for third party reliance upon that agency without liability. It provides for an agency where the courts will honor what the principal has done. It provides for an can be assured that they agency where third parties can... will not have criminal or civil liability. It deals sensitive area of the law. It has an exception from the broad power, the principal has, to provide by eliminating the opportunity for him to appoint a medical doctor or a health provider for the purposes of his agent. This, Ladies and Gentlemen, will give the principal an opportunity to have a proxy to deal in the verv areas of life or death after the principal is sensitive disabled. He has concurrent powers with the agent time of his lifetime and until such time as the agent is called upon the act, the agent need not act. There is a provision for its survival after death if the principal has a desire to provide for donation of organs to appropriate authorities. I ask for its passage."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sutker, moves for the passage of House Bill 842. And on that, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hill the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, he indicates he Will."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Countryman: "Thank you. Representative Sutker, explain for me, if you will, what you meant when you explained that you could delegate something to a medical doctor or some other health care person."
- Sutker: "You cannot provide for a medical doctor, under this Bill, to be your agent for health care or personal purposes. You cannot provide for a health provider to be your agent, and that is the exception which is set forth in the Bill, to a broad power of appointment, and that's being done candidly, Representative Countryman, to make certain that there is no conflict of interest, no conflict of involvement between the health care provider and the principal or its agent."
- Countryman: "Can you... can you draft the power of attorney? I sometimes draft them. People don't want them to be effective immediately, but should they be unable to physically or mentally handle their affairs, they want the power to come into effect and what we'll say is that my physician can certify that I'm not capable of handling my affairs. Can that still occur?"
- Sutker: "That's an excellent question, because you can dο 50. You have broad... a broad scope of directions which you can provide for. There is... it is true, forms which are available, which attornevs can use as for determining specific kinds of actions that a principal would want his agent to provide, but it's expected that the principal can change the forms that are provided for through and by his attorney. The device... the tool of the forms of agency which we provide here are only discretionary."
- Countryman: "Now, when I last read the Bill or the... one of the
  Amendments, I had some discussion with you, there was a
  short form power contained in there that allowed the power

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- of attorney to contain many powers that weren't explicitly set forth. Is that right?"
- Sutker: "That is correct. There is a short form and that you can expand upon that form."
- Countryman: "Alright. But, there is also a warning, as I recall, at the end of that short form in an attempt to tell the person making the power of attorney, the grantor, I guess, or the power of attorney, the effect of that power of attorney. Is that correct?"
- Sutker: "That is correct, Representative Countryman, we are aware that we are dealing in a very sensitive area. We would be hopeful that the forms would be used, but we would also be hopeful that the principal would seek legal advice with respect to how he wants to fill out that form and what powers he wants to give to his agent and what alternative options he may suggest to his agent."
- Countryman: "Alright, so then, you're saying you think it's probably a good idea if somebody gets legal advice before signing even one of these short forms. Is that correct?"
- Sutker: "I would think that that would be prudent and that would be expected."
- Countryman: "Did... We had some discussion in Committee about removal of the agent. Does this Bill have anything to do with the removal of the agent?"
- Sutker: "The agent can be removed by court order, and there is ample provision for interested persons to proceed in a court of competent jurisdiction to act in the event the agent somehow abbrogates the power given to him or ignores the power given to him, and there are appropriate punishment for such actions."
- Countryman: "Would... who would be defined as an interested person?"
- Sutker: "A member of the family, spouse."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Countryman: "Alright. Could a creditor have... be an interested person?"
- Sutker: "I wouldn't think that a creditor would come under the definition of an interested person in this instance."
- Countryman: "They are under... generally, under the Probate court... Code considered an interested person."
- Sutker: "It may very well be that a court may determine that this can be expanded, but I would suggest that it should be very narrowly interpreted as to whom an interested person is."
- Countryman: "Alright, and this is a change, then, in the current law of Illinois when somebody become..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Countryman: "Thank you. I just want to clarify this point."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

- Countryman: "There is a change in the current law of Illinois when a person becomes disabled, in essence, unable to handle their affairs, now this power of attorney will be able to last beyond that. Is that correct?"
- Sutker: "The current law of Illinois fails at that precise point.

  Under the current law of Illinois, upon a disability, the agency automatically terminates. Under this Bill, the agency continues on, because we believe that to be the intention of the principal. That's when you need the agent most, when the disability occurs to the principal, and that is why it is now one of the major advancements in the law of agency. It survives disability."

Countryman: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative, I wonder if you... Would he yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Sutker: "I'll yield."

Ewing: "Representative Sutker, this is a durable power of attorney."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Sutker: "That's correct, yes."

Ewing: "Now, in the case where a person has signed one of these documents and then is later adjudged to be a disabled adult, does the power of attorney continue?"

Sutker: "It does. It survives the disability, and that's what it's intended to do."

Ewing: "Alright. How does that work if there is any problem between what the guardian for the disabled adult may think is proper and the power of attorney?"

under the power of attorney, has superior Sutker: "The agent, powers over the guardian that may be appointed over estate, but... it's quite true, however, that if there is a conflict and the court determines that the agent is not acting in the interest of the principal, a court would have jurisdiction to overturn that particular rule of this the Bill, but there would have to be clear and convincing evidence that the agent is acting in derogation of his give the principal The whole idea is to opportunity to appoint a trusted person who will act on his with respect to medical problems. health and personal problems that may develop in his lifetime. And for that purpose he has chosen someone whom he relies on and who is not appointed by the court. It is expected that the court would only have eventual oversight in the event that there was some action on the part of the agent which was either fraudulent or criminal."

Ewing: "Well, it would seem to me that there is a possibility for conflict here. We do have in our statute the provisions that you can nominate who you would like to be appointed as your guardian while you are still competent and then you would only have one person authorized to act for you. That bothers me greatly that we could end up with this durable power of attorney and some other family member appointed by

#### 50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the court in a constant conflict. I could see additional court time being consumed by this. I just don't know why we really need this. He have provision where you could now nominate the person you want the court to appoint.

- Sutker: "It is expected, Representative Ewing, that this is such a sensitive area that, and it deals with personal and health care problems, that the appointed agent supersedes any and all people, because this is the intention of the principal and this is what the principal set forth in his power of attorney and very specifically addressed."
- Ewing: "I may... I may have missed a very important point. Does
  this durable power of attorney only deal with medical?
  What about their property and..."
- Sutker: "This power of attorney deals with health care problems, medical problems and personal problems of a physical or mental nature."
- Ewing: "Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not certain that all of my reservations are gone. I think that the last point does clear up some things to make it more palatable. I thought they would both have complete power.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

  Mr. Sutker, to close."
- Sutker: MMr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll ask for a favorable Roll Call on this House Bill 842. It brings Illinois in step with the progressive states of this nation. It's needed and it's needed now. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 93 'aye', 17 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

having received the Constitutional Majority... 3ill. Hicks votes 'aye'. This question, there are 94 'aye', 17 "present". This Bill. having received Constitutional Hajority, is hereby declared passed. On Order appears House Bill 844. Mr. Clerk, read the this Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of This is the DuPage County Liquor Tax Bill. the House This Bill was requested by the DuPage County Board vote of 15-6. They requested that a liquor tax be enacted It would be used to fund a new treatment in Springfield. program for repeat drunk driving offenders in DuPage. planned on raising a 1,000,000 dollars in revenues which would be used to pay for the program and help pay for a two story maximum security addition to their county jail. this Bill that I have raises the tax higher than what requested. They asked for 1,000,000 dollars. This tax will bring in 2.3 million. So, after the Bill got out of Committee, as quoted in the Wheaton Daily Journal on May 9th, the Cook County Board... a DuPage County Board member, Merkle. Republican from Elmhurst. pleased the Bill passed through Committee even though it provides more money than the county wants. He county could return the unused tax "That's nkav\*. The money to rebate property taxes. So, if this Bill passes, been requested by the DuPage County Board, there will be a property tax reduction in DuPage County of million dollars annually. And who's going to pay it? DuPage County drunks who buy their liquor in DuPage County

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

that the property taxes will be reduced in DuPage County. Now, anyone in Cook County has to vote Bill. If it's true that people flee to DuPage County to buy their liquor because it's cheaper, that means that i f 8ill passes, they'll stay in Cook County and Cook County will get more money. Anyone who lives or represents Kane or Hill County, that border DuPage, has because those people will flee DuPage and buy their liquor in Kane or Will and as a result. thev will make more money. So, everybody in Cook has to vote for it. Everybody in Kane has to vote for it. Everybody in Will has to vote for it. And in DuPage County, if you represent DuPage County, this Bill, first of all, was asked and requested by the DuPage County Board and the DuPage County Board member. Edward Merkle. Republican from Elmhurst. \*if this Bill passes, there will be a 1.3 million dollar annual property tax rebate for DuPage County. ask for an "ave" vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the passage of House Bill 844. Before that. that the Chair has observed a number of lobbyists who have come on the floor in the last few days. The Chair will diligently make sure that there are no lobbyists on verv this floor while we are in Session. Now. I cannot clearer to those people... those are friends who are lobbyists, if you wish to help us, help us off this floor. And αn this issue, the Gentleman from Lake, Mati ievich."
- Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton, I'm going to vote for this
  Bill because I believe in Santa Claus, and also, I'm from
  Lake County, but by the time those drunks from DuPage drive
  all the way that far, they'll never make it. So, I'm going
  to vote for it."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

- McCracken: "I don't have any witty response to make. I'm lost for words. If he's having fun with the Bill, more power to him. I flew down with Representative Cullerton, ī last week. maybe this week, and he spent the entire plane ride reading about himself in the Hheaton Daily Journal. was trying to sleep, I was trying to sleep to conserve my energy and he kept interrupting my sleep. 'Hey, Tom, look at this. Look at this. I'm in the paper'. So. have fun, more power to him, but it is a serious issue, and he's... this Bill was not asked for bу Board. and all kidding aside. Someday it could happen to some other county, and today it's happening to us. So. watch yourselves because he could turn on any of you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from... Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

  Bowman."
- Bowman: "Well, I'm just going to ask leave for the Attendance
  Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Barger."
- Barger: "Would like to compliment the Gentleman from Chicago for the excellent presentation that he made. He's not only humorous, but he's also funny. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, formerly DuPage, Mr.
  Cullerton, to close."
- Cullerton: "Well, it might be funny, but it... the reason why I was reading those papers is to find out what the sentiment is out there in DuPage County, and that's why I quoted the Republican from Elmhurst, Mr. Edward Merkle, who says, 'It's more than we asked for, but here is what we're going to do. We're going to return the unused tax money by rebating property taxes'. So, I... that's not my quote, that's the quote from the Republican County Board member from Elmhurst. Elmhurst. Now, the Republicans in Cook

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

County went crazy when Cook County imposed a liquor tax, because they said everybody is going to flee to the other counties to buy their liquor. Hell, if that's the case, if that's true, if those Republican Cook County Board members were correct, then they'll flee into Hill. They'll flee into Kane and I would suggest to you that the vote that was taken by the DuPage County Board, the vote... the score was 15-6 in favor of imposing a liquor tax so that they could fund a very worthy project, a treatment center, for drunk drivers. I would appreciate an "aye" vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
- McPike: "Ar. McCracken, you had to sit next to John for an hour on the plane. I have to sit next to him all day long. I have been trying to go through some notes over here for the last hour and every time I do, he hits me with this paper. Look at what's in the paper today. If we pass the Bill, I can do some work. If we don't pass the Bill, I got to listen to John on this issue over and over for the next six weeks, and so will you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner, one minute to explain your vote."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. McCracken, I was listening to your comments, and with that in mind, and knowing that we have six weeks left, and Cook County is always the County that's looked at by all, I tend to agree with you and I'm going to give you a 'no' vote and ask that you be nice to my county, also."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 34 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to obtain a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. On this order appears House Bill 941. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 941, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the compensation of county officials.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 941 provides a 3,500 dollar annual stipend to be to 21 elected county recorders for the additional duties that are imposed upon them by the state and the State These recorders currently have Department of Revenue. additional duties with regard to mortgage declarations, responsibility for special buildings to various state agencies and special attention of plats lying within This method has been used in the past to try to provide the stipend to other county officials for whom state imposes additional duties. This is an attempt to do the same for county recorders. I would answer anv that the Members might have, and if there are auestions none, Mr. Speaker, would move for the passage."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, moves for the passage of House Bill 941. And on that, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have the greatest amount of respect for the Sponsor, but we have continually had this debate. I think this is probably the fifth or sixth time, and I suspect it will be the first time this year and probably several times after this, we'll see this come back. But I fail to see, and I watch county officials, I watched the county clerks

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the stipend and they said that they needed it because of all the duties that the consolidated elections And frankly, that's the duty that they were on themsupposed to carry out in the first place, and then go through the compensation Bills and we pass them. That's the job that they ran for. In these 21 situations, recall, these people run for the job. Now, we've had to go down and we've had to give to everybody down the line. Иe had to give them another 3,500 dollars a year. And this is 3,500 dollar a year pay raise and it's coming out of State Treasury. And frankly. I go into the recorder's office to record a deed and I fail to see that these duties, even if the duties that the Representative who sponsors this 8ill indicates are responsibilities of the I fail to see that they really mandate any great recorder. duty. Those people are working 8:30 to 4:30, and the counties, which I represent, there is an elected recorder in one of them, but in some of them. the duties handled by the county clerk. They just aren't that And frankly, I just think that this is a waste of great. the taxpayers dollars. I think we don't need to carry... there isnot a real logical extension of even the other 1 didn't support the other stipends and still stipends. don't support the other stipends. It is not the state's obligation to stipend out all county officials. And for that reason, I urge the Members to look at this, remember that it's a pay raise Bill and ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "In previous stipends that we've had in some county, the county boards have, in fact, reduced their portion so that the elected county official actually received no more

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

money. In this Bill, is that provision taken care of to prevent that from happening?"

Steczo: "House Bill 941, Representative Ropp, simply provides for the stipend. However, in House Bill 1979, which... hopefully... will be considered at some point during the course of the session, we provide that, in fact, that salaries should not be reduced. That is not the intention of the General Assembly to reduce the salary proportionate to the amount of the stipend."

Ropp: "But that's clearly stated in the Bill to prevent it or is it just somewhat understood on the House floor?"

Steczo: "I believe it's understood in the... on the House floor.

And it's not specifically stated in the Bill, although if
the Bill were to pass or if that language were to be
needed, we would gladly put that in."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I don't rise much to speak or against the Bill because I think arguments could be made on either side of this issue, but I would like to point out what I believe to be the irony of what we did and look at the history of how we got to this point. If you remember how all this started. It was an attempt to be austere and to fund various programs such as the DUI programs by adding a fee to various fines that were paid by traffic violators. And we added so many different that were supposed to go toward supporting these systems that the circuit clerks came to us and said. \*Hev. vou\*re putting to many burdens on us. He're going to have to go through all this accounting, have people to figure out where all these fees go. And so in response, and to pacify the circuit clerks, we said, 'Alright, we'll ahead and give you 3,500 dollars of state money to pay for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

all of those added burdens we gave you. Well, it wasn't long after that that the county clerks came in and said, \*Wait a minute, you just gave our friends, the circuit clerks, 3,500 dollars. What about us? Just a couple of years ago, you went to consolidated elections and now we're running all of the elections. So, where is our dollars? So, we gave it to them. And it wasn't much after that that the county treasurers came in and \*Hey, we work very closely with the county clerks and we\*re not far removed from the circuit clerks. You really didn't add to our burdens, but, hey, we ought to get that 3,500 dollars. And so we said, 'Well, okay, they're treasurers, so we ought to give... let's give them the 3,500 dollar. Now, we've got the county recorders. I would submit to you next year we're going to have the county auditors, we're going to get the county coroners, and I'm not here to suggest that any one of these positions ought to get it not get it, but I just point out what we do sometimes. Ьv starting the ball rolling in order to accommodate a little problem at the time and how it always seems to end up in a big snowball. So, here we are in the middle of all these and I guess you could vote just about either way you want."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise in support of this legislation. Those who are affected by this legislation are people who are... ran for the job of county recorder and did so promising to fulfill the duties of that job and to accept whatever salary was presented to them. However, they have families to feed. They have bills to pay and they have an increased burden. Everything... we, of all people, should know the increased burden that we're placing upon everyone. The statute books

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

keep growing in size, and some of those laws to be enforced filter down to the county recorders. This is a minimum amount of compensation, additional compensation for those county recorders who are affected. They do their job. They work hard. They deserve this money. And I ioin in support would strongly urge you to legislation. Cast a green vote for people back home are working hard, who can't determine their own pay raises, who can't determine their own stipends, who need this money and can put it to good use and even with it, certainly will not be overpaid. I urge a green vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Ar. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Stephens: "Representative Steczo I follow your legislation closely because it usually is well thought out legislation, but the one problem I'm having with this is the to be that because we mandate more activity, more work for the department of the recorder that we ought to be sending more money to make up for the extra work. but. indeed. we\*re not doing that. He're giving it to the actual recorder who's got a staff who's probably doing the work, and they complain. We have to hire more people to do the typing, the computer input, whatever. And so, I don't follow your line of thinking. I really don\*t. wonder, are they working more hours? ₩hat\*s the real reason behind this?"

Steczo: "Representative Stephens, keep in mind that the ultimate responsibility as to whether or not the jobs that they perform meet the actual state criteria lies with the elected recorder. We here in the General Assembly approve pay raises for department chairs in state government. Yet,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

they have underlings and staff people as well, but the ultimate responsibility for state policy and department policy rests with those department directors. The same holds true for elected officials county—wide. They may have staffs, but they are the ones that have the ultimate responsibility to implement policy and to follow the dictates of the state and make sure that those dictates are followed properly and in order and according to the guidelines."

Stephens: "So, it's not so much the extra work, but the extra responsibility."

Steczo: "Yes."

Stephens: "Do you know if Logan County has a recorder?"

Steczo: "Do they have a... I don't have the list with me, but
they have an elected recorder and not a clerk recorder.

They would qualify."

Stephens: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I reiterate the statement that was just made about the responsibility. The fact is, that there are 21 county recorders in the State of Illinois who we, as a General Assembly, have mandated extra responsibility and those responsibilities, again, are complex in some cases, such as mortgage declarations and special billings and plats and what have you. They would not have the responsibility in the General Assembly had said for them not to have We, in fact, did mandate and there are those them. that since we did mandate these responsibilities who feel and in some ways, that we should be somewhat responsible paying for those. So, House Bill 941 follows in the steps of the other Bills. Other county officials currently get the stipend. This is one for the recorders because

50th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1987
- the responsibilities we mandate and I would encourage a  $\mbox{"yes"}$  vote-  $\mbox{"}$
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

  Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 54 'no', 2 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority ... Mr. Countryman?"
- Countryman: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb asks for verification of the Affirmative Roll. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, asks for a poll of those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "A poll of those not voting. The only Member not voting is Representative Barger."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. White, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. White goes from 'present to 'aye'. Mr. Huff? Mr. Huff goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Yes, Mr. Countryman?"
- Countryman: "I can see it's going the wrong way. I withdraw the request."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, on this question, there are 62 'aye',
  53 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received
  the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On
  this Order appears House Bill 989. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 989, a Bill for an Act to amend certain

  Acts in relationship to Mass Transit. Third Reading of the

  Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This is the RTA CTA vehicle. It goes to the

# 50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Senate. There will be a meeting later in the month of June. If there is not an agreement from Mr. Churchill and myself and the two Senators involved, plus the RTA and the CTA, the Bill would not be called for a vote. I move for the passage of the Bill.
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, moves for the passage of House Bill 989. And on that, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. I would confirm the previous

  Speaker's remarks and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote those \*no\* • Voting is open, this is final passage. Have all who wish? Have all voted who wish? voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question. 87 'aye', 14 'no', 15 'present'. are This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And ดก this order of business Gentleman has a Bill, House Bi11 308. Mr. Clerk. with leave, House Bill 308."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 308, a Bill for an Act in relationship to sewer and water projects. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Majority Leader
  McPike,"
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Build Illinois clean up Bill. He went through the Amendments the other day. I would be glad to answer any questions, but I think they were explained on Second Reading and I move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, moves for the passage of House Bill 308. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Dops, I'm sorry. Yes, Mr. Hallock, the

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Gentleman from Winnebago?"

- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we discussed this Bill the other day we had some disagreements. I believe we can work those out in the Senate, and I would ask that this Bill be adopted and passed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 ...

  I'm sorry ... 101 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, Government Administration appears House Bill 1063. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the Appellate Court. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House. House Bill 1063 deals with the Appellate Court. increases the number of Appellate Court Judges in the Ιt Second and in the Fifth Judicial District to six Appellate Right now, the Supreme Court has the power Court Judges. to appoint the Judges on a temporary basis where there is a need for it. In each of these circuits they have appointed Judges ... Circuit Court Judges to act as the Appellate So, what this Bill would do would be to allow for the actual election as there is supposed to be of the Appellate Court Judges from that Circuit. I would ask for your favorable support."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the passage of House Bill 1063. And on that, is there any discussion?

  The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson. Alright. There being

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

none, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 63 "aye", 49 "no", 2 voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this order appears House Bill 1064."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1064, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the Circuit Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Graiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you • Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Bill deals with the issue of the Circuit and Circuit Court Judges. This would provide for the election of one additional Circuit Court Judge from St. Clair County, one Circuit Court Judge from Madison County. Amendment #4 on the Bill, Representative Johnson's ₩ith Amendment, provides for a Circuit Court Judge, resident Champaign County. Representative Countryman's Amendment \$23 deals with Judges from Kendall County and one from DeKalb County. I would be happy to answer any questions. The same thing is true with regard to this matter. And I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves
for the passage of House Bill 1064. And on that, is there
any discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Ar. Chairman. Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for questions."

Olson: "Representative Cullerton, I am not aware of any great growth in Kendall County. Can you supply me with any figures which would justify a new Judge in that county?"

Cullerton: "Hell, first ... The first I want to do is to also

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

indicate that there is additional Judges in Lake County.

No, that is in the Bill. Alright, the Lake County Judges was Representative Friedrick's Amendment and that also was on the Bill. That dealt with Lake County ... two in Lake and one in McHenry. Now, back to your question, Sir. It deals with the County of ..."

Dison: "Kendall."

Cullerton: "Kendall? And the question was?"

Olson: "Is that one of our fast track growth areas in this State?"

Cullerton: "Hell, I think a lot of people are trying to get away from these liquor taxes."

Olson: "How many people live in Kendall County?"

Cullerton: "It's a growing number."

Olson: "Huge, would you say?"

Cullerton: "And there's a lot of crime out there, too."

Olson: "Hell, I don't think so because they have got a wonderful State's Attorney and ..."

Cullerton: "Well, you can ask Representative Countryman."

Olson: "Hell, I ... No, I don't care to ask him because then he will say I used his name in debate. I'd rather ask you the question."

Cullerton: "Hell, he sponsored the Amendment."

Olson: "DeKalb County, Representative Cullerton. Have you been to DeKalb County recently?"

Cullerton: "Sure, that's where my cousin starred as a quarterback for the Northern Illinois football team. Now he plays for the Los Angeles Rams."

Olson: "And you regularly visit DeKalb? You've noticed a huge growth on ..."

Cullerton: "It's a university town and you know about the problems they have there with the lack of Judges."

Olson: "In other words a good share of the people who go to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

DeKalb come from Chicago. Are they problems?"

- Cullerton: "Representative, let me explain something which is very important to understand. The Supreme Court has 50 Judges, who are paid by us, that are assigned in areas where they are needed. Okay? These are not Judges who are elected the way they are supposed to be under the law from their Judicial Circuit. They are appointed by the and that's what's happened in these cases. So. all we are doing is providing for the election of that Judae rather than to have to have the Supreme Court make the appointment."
- Olson: "One other quick question. What is the salary today of an elected Circuit Judge, as opposed to the cost of raising a recorders salary."

Cullerton: "As opposed to what?"

Olson: "Raising the ... a recorder's salary. Does the Circuit

Judge make about \$77,000 these days?"

Cullerton: "No, they make \$80,099."

Olson: "Oh, that's even better than we thought."

- Cullerton: "But you have to remember ... But my point is that there's no ... there's no increase in cost to the State because the Supreme Court would ... the Supreme ..."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Chair believes this is a very serious subject."
- Cullerton: "The Supreme Court is appointing the Judges now.

  There's not going to be any additional Judges. It will just be a more local control, if you understand."
- Olson: "I'm pleased to see we're sending that control back to the local government."
- Cullerton: "In this particular case. In the case of Lake County,
  however, there will be additional Judges. Because in Lake
  County I don't think the Supreme Court has filled ... has
  appointed additional Judges. And quite frankly, I was very

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

surprised in speaking to the Chief Judge of Lake County that they only have like 7 Circuit Court Judges. And that definitely is a growing county and they do need additional Judges there.

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Yes, thank you. Hell, I'm just pleased to see that
Representative Cullerton is exhibiting a tremendous
interest now in the fast track Kendall County. And he
probably would claim to be a friend of Dallas Eggemeson,
who is a friend of mine. And I very likely will accept his
recommendation but I'm not going to use John Countryman's
name in debate."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "St. Clair and Madison County would each get an additional Circuit Judge?"

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Stephens: "They would probably come from those Counties, is that right?"

Cullerton: "I'm sorry?"

Stephens: "They would have to reside in those counties to be elected?"

Cullerton: "They have to reside in the Circuit."

Stephens: "Okay. The ... Which is in that area, Madison, St.

Clair ..."

Cullerton: "No, I'm sorry. They have to be a resident of Madison

County and they have to be a resident of St. Clair County.

They have to be a resident of each."

Stephens: "They have to be residents of each of those counties.

They would probably be Cardinal fans. Speaking of the Cardinals ..."

Cullerton: "Yes?"

Stephens: "They are now the first place Cardinals."

Cullerton: "By percentage points."

50th Legislative Day May 20, 1987

Stephens: "No, a whole game ahead."

Cullerton: "That's impossible. They were a whole game behind when they started. They are only ahead by percentage points. Check it out in the morning."

Stephens: "I'll vote for your Bill and check it out in the morning."

Cullerton: "Okay."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open and this is final action. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all a11 voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this auestion. there are 67 'aye', 43 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. declared passed. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar \$2. on the Order of Motion appears House Bill I'm sorry, appears Senate Bill 219. Out of the Record. this Order appears Senate Bill 243. Mr. Clerk? Is Mr. Terzich in the Chamber? Mr. Terzich. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 243, a Motion."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 243. I move to discharge registration and regulation for further consideration and advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, Senate Bill 243."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on a Motion."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would have a Motion that we discharge the Registration and Regulation Committee from further consideration and advance to a Second Reading, Second Legislative Day on Senate Bill 243."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves to discharge Committee on Regulation and Registration from further consideration and the Bill placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Day. And on that, is there any discussion? The Lady from LaSalle, Ms. Breslin."

Breslin: "Question of ... question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for a question."

Breslin: "Representative Terzich, could you tell us what this

Bill does and why you want to ••••"

Terzich: "This is the Madical Practice Act which basically has been agreed upon and the ... which also increases the licensing fees and so forth for physicians which have to be mailed out by May 28th."

Breslin: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "We're in agreement. Roll it."

Speaker Greiman: "Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call?

Alright, leave is granted. He will use the Attendance Roll

Call with respect to the Motion to discharge R and R from further consideration and place this on the Order of Second Reading, Second Day. And on ... Hr. Clerk, read the Bill.

On the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 243, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, for just a moment, I would like to go on the Order of Trivial Pursuit and advise you that today we have passed 94 Bills, House Bills. The Senate has passed a mere 50 Senate Bills. Now, I would tell you this also, that to date we have passed 559 House Bills. 303 have been sponsored by Democratic Sponsors, or 54% of the Bills passed, although

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

the Democrats constitute 57%. Republican Sponsors have passed 256 Bills, representing 46% of the Bills passed, although they constitute only 43% of the Membership. I hope ... there will probably be an examination later on on these. Let me see, Mr. McCracken? Did you wish to ... do you have something trivial to say? Proceed."

- McCracken: "Inquiry of the Chair. Are you counting the
- Speaker Greiman: "I asked the same question. But we're counting
  ... we're counting Appropriation Bills, Children's Bills
  and all Bills. Yes, Ar. Piel, what did you wish to add to
  contribute, Sir."
- Piel: "The word I heard was that 99% of the Consent Calendar were

  Republican Bills. So, we have been arguing over Democratic

  Bills. right?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman?"
- Hoffman: "Thank vou. Ar. Speaker. Your numbers, your statistics illustrate the wisdom of Representative Representative Rice. They should get the award for outstanding Legislators because of their lack o f productivity."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hallock?"
- Hallock: "I would like to know what percent of the Democratic
  Bills were Lee Preston Bills?"
- Speaker Greiman: "The computers were broken on that computation.

  Mr. Clerk ... Mr. Clerk, a Motion with respect from Mr.

  Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would make a Motion pursuant to Rule 5(c), rather to suspend Rule 5(c) with respect to Senate Bill 1085. This is the Revisory Bill. The Rule pertains to printing and placing on the desks, copies of the Bill which is 226 pages. I believe the other side is signed off on the Motion."

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves to suspend ... to waive
  Rule 5(c) with respect to the printing of the Revisory
  Bill. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr.
  McCracken. Alright, Mr. Hallock?"
- Hallock: "Yes, this is the Motion that was brought up earlier in the day and he postponed it until now. We agree with it and support it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Pullen?"
- Pullen: "Hould the Sponsor please state for the record whether there is anything substantive in this Bill."
- Homer: "The Revisory Bill combines multiple versions of sections amended by the 84th General Assembly that have not previously been combined and re-numbers sections of Acts to eliminate duplication, and corrects technical errors in various Acts. It's effective immediately. Has no substantive language whatsoever."
- Speaker Greiman: "Using the Attendance Roll Call, leave to waive Rule 5(c). Leave is granted. Now returning to the call on page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1068. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill. Yes, Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "I thought we were done. I'll wait."

Speaker Greiman: "House Bill 1068."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Disaster Relief. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Leverenz, on House
  Bill 1068."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill would provide that
  the. State would reimburse units of local governments for
  disaster relief and only in those areas declared a disaster
  by the President. Answer any questions you might have. I
  do ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, has moved for the passage of House Bill 1068. And on that, is

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 91 'aye', 22 'present'. This Bill. votina having received the Constitutional Hajority, is hereby declared passed. On Order appears House Bill 1081. this Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. House Bill 1081 is simply a good government Bill with the intent to correct a problem before it spreads. is, that in a community college, trustees of the State of Illinois will not be entitled to personal personal staff. The Community College Trustees have office space available for their temporary needs this legislation does not deprive them of this need. The Community College regular staff are available to help the trustees. They do not need a personal staff. I believe that the intent of this 3ill is to make sure the are going for the educational are not ending up in small dynasties throughout the State. And I would ask for your support and answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann, moves for the passage of House Bill 1081. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young."

Young: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for questions."

Young: "Representative, is this space being used now or ... I'm

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

wondering why we need this Bill?"

- McGann: "There are some areas in the State where this is occurring and it is felt as though that, the information I have received, that now will be the time, because they serve, the Trustees serve without compensation. They do have travel expense, of course, for important needs that are related to the role of a Board of Trustee. But, to make sure that this does not happen is the purpose of this legislation at this time."
- Young: "Hell, if a trustee wanted to use space in a school to do some work for a day and was given an office to sit in and a desk to work at, would be violating the provisions of this Bill if he did that?"

McGann: "No, he would not. No, he would not."

Young: "So, this Bill is directed at a permanent office space and permanent staff?"

McGann: "In other words, a personal office space and a personal staff. That's what it is dealing directly with, Representative."

Young: "Thank you."

McGann: "And as I stated in my opening remarks, there is space available and there are staffs available."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I just ... I don't know a lot about Community Colleges
so let me understand. The Community College in our area is
Parkland. The elected Board of Trustees at Parkland
College, this Bill would prohibit their having an office
space in their own Community College or in another one?"

McGann: "No. This would be in their ... in other words, an elected Board of Trustee or an appointed Board of Trustee.

They would not be entitled to personal office space or a personal staff. And in my almost 15 years as a Trustee, I never need to have a personal staff. I was a member

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Trustee, Vice Chairman and Chairman through the years."

- Johnson: "My question, Representative McGann, was, does the Bill address the ability of an elected or appointed member of the Board of Trustees of Parkland College from having his space at Parkland College? Or does it prohibit him from having a space in an adjoining college? I would understand that it makes a lot of sense that you wouldn't want a Parkland Board of Trustees member to have an office at an adjoining college. But, why does it matter to you if somebody would have a personal office in the Board, you know, the people elect him. And if the people that run the college think it's appropriate for him to have a personal office, why does that matter?"
- McGann: "Well, because there is actually no need for it, because they have office space available for them at any time.

  That's always available and the general staff is always available to the Trustee. So, there is no need to have a personal office and a personal staff. That is what I'm addressing here."
- Johnson: "Is there been ... now, really, I don't know the genesis of the Bill. I'm not trying to be argumentative. Has there been some abuse of this? And if so, can you tell us where it's been, what it's cost and so forth?"
- McGann: "Hell, I believe ... I'm not sure in regard to cost.

  When you talk about cost, you're talking about the office space. You're talking about the cost of the staff, I don't know what that amounts to, but once again, that does deprive dollars that should be going to education. And the areas ... the areas, there were a couple, ... one was in Thornton and another was in Triton where there were problems. And you know what happened in Triton."
- Johnson: "Hhere they had personal offices. Is that what you are saying?"

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

McGann: "I ... Yeah, they were creating small dynasties."

Johnson: "I see. Okay."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook. Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I would like to compliment the Gentleman on this
fine Bill, and I certainly hope that it has overwhelming

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the I have a lot of respect for the Sponsor and I Assembly. we've discussed this issue and I realize what he is trying to do in terms of saving some costs. I think is an issue that should be left up to the local community colleges and they should determine how best their trustees should be operating and if they are overspending or underspending. I think that we are now overstepping bounds in terms or trying to regulate community colleges on statewide level from here in Springfield, and I urge the Membership to vote 'no' on this Bill. I think it should be left up to the local community college districts to do."

Speaker Greiman: "Ar. Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Moments ago, Sir, I heard you mention Triton College.

Hould you explain the problems that arose at Triton
College?"

McGann: "Hell, I think that the newspapers, in recent years, the actions that were going on out there in Triton speak for themselves."

Leverenz: "I don't think they speak for themselves, and you are unable to enumerate them as they relate to this Bill. Is that correct?"

McGann: "No, I wouldn't say that. I think that I don't want to

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- get into personalities but ..."
- Leverenz: "Was there anything in the newspaper that related to personal office space?"
- McGann: "Not specifically office space, no."
- Leverenz: "Has there anything that related to staff at the Community College of Triton?"
- McGann: "Yes."
- Leverenz: "Hould you explain the Bill as it defines the items of expense qualifying for reimbursement."
- McGann: "It is just clarifying the expenses that are being •••"
- Leverenz: "What are they?"
- McGann: "Hell, for example, if they are traveling to a Trustees
  Association, which was relative to their duties as a
  College Trustee, they should have that expense. But, if
  they are just traveling to some convention that does not
  relate to their role as a trustee, they should not have
  expense."
- Leverenz: "Does this at all relate to the Chicago City Colleges.
  Sir?"
- McGann: "Not specifically, no. It relates to the Community

  College District, the 39 Community College Districts in the

  State of Illinois."
- Leverenz: "Why does it not relate to the Chicago City Colleges?"
- McGann: "Hell, it does, also, because that's one of the 39 districts."
- Leverenz: "Then it does relate to the Chicago City Colleges doesn't it?"
- McGann: "Hell, if you want to ... I don't want to isolate them.

  I want to ..."
- Leverenz: "No, I said ... My first question was, does it relate
  also to Chicago City Colleges. And you said, 'no it does
  not'."
- McGann: "No, I'm sorry. I correct that. Awfully sorry. I did

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

state, though, in the rest of my paragraph or sentence, I stated that it is a member ... District 508 in the City Colleges in Chicago are part of the Community College Districts in the State of Illinois, which total 39.

Leverenz: "Do you not trust those who run the 39 Districts that we have in this State, then? Their judgement?"

McGann: "It's not a question of trust. You see...

Leverenz: "Their judgment..."

McGann: "...the Community Colleges in the State of Illinois are governed by the Community College Act, and that comes from the State, not from the locality, it comes from the State."

Leverenz: "Did you have office space?"

McGann: "No. I did not."

Leverenz: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann to close."

McGann: "I would just, at the late hour, not σo into a dissertation in regards to this year. I do believe, that a said. it should be left to the local communities. We can't let that to the local communities because the dollars come through the Community College Act of the State of Illinois. We govern everything through our direction as far as the Community College Act is concerned. I do believe that this is a good movement. It's going the right direction. It's just going to protect educational dollars to be used in education and not dvnasties. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, one minute to explain your vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is an excellent program. The

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

resources that are available to any school district should be maximized for the use of the clients, the young people which they are to serve. I think this kind of limitation is a move in the right direction, and I rise in support of it.  $^{\infty}$ 

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all ... Ar. McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."

McCracken: "I agree."

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 51 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having ... yes, Mr. McGann, do you wish this on the Order of Postponed Consideration?"
- McGann: "Yes, I would like to have an Order of Postponed

  Consideration."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Bill will be placed on the Order of Consideration Postponed. Now returning, Ladies and Gentlemen, to House Calendar Supplemental 02. On the Order of Motions appears Senate Bill 219. Mr. Clerk, for a Motion. Senate Bill 219."
- Clerk Leone: "On Supplemental Calendar \$2. I move to discharge

  Judiciary I from further consideration and advance to

  Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, Senate Bill 219."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell on the Motion."
- O°Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we discharge Judiciary I from further consideration and advance to Second Reading, Senate Bill 219 to the Second Legislative Day."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that we discharge Senate Bill 219 from the Judiciary Committee 1 and the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading.

50th Legislative Day

- Hay 20, 1987
- Second Day. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik."
- Kubik: "Just for the record, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor explain what this Bill is?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. O'Connell?"
- O\*Connell: "Yes. This is the compromise with the Medical Society
  and the legal community whereby the Statute of Limitations
  is reduced from 22 years to 8 years to bring a malpractice
  case against a physician for an act occurring during the
  delivery of a child."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I rise as Chairman of House Judiciary I Committee to indicate my support for this Motion. Thank you, very
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Well, join the litany here. As a Republican spokesman on this Committee, I think this is well considered and appropriate to do what the Motion seeks to do."
- Speaker Greiman: "Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call?

  Leave is granted. And the Committee ... and Senate Bill

  219 is hereby discharged from Judiciary I Committee for
  further consideration and it is advanced to the Order of
  Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, read
  the Bill on Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 219, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "To have us in shape, ready to go tomorrow, I wonder if the Clerk could read in Perfunctory Session for a second time, all those Bills appearing on the Special Orders of

## 50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

- Call after Vehicle Code. They have not been read a second time. They don't appear in the Calendar under Special Order. They're just in the first two pages. So, they'll need to be read."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Alright, Ar. McCracken, not only is your point well taken. I think we will have the Clerk read all of the Bills that are on Second Reading. They'll remain on the Order of Second Reading, but they'll be read a second time. So, we will remain in Perfunct Session allowing the Clerks time for that. Ar. Piel, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Piel: "Announcement, Mr. Speaker. Knowing that we are going to be in until 8:00 tonight, I was asked to advise the Members that the reception by the Illinois Bankers Association has been extended until 8:30 at the Sangamo Club."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad we're adjourning because the next Bill on the Calendar was one by Wayne Goforth. Then he had another one on the same order. I don't think he wants to pass 3 Bills in one day."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, As. Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just think we should express appreciation to our dedicated Clerks, that they are going to stay late tonight to read all of those Second Readings."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, on the Adjournment ... Mr. McPike moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 9:00 a.m. tomorrow. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the House does now stand adjourned until the hour of 9:00 a.m. tomorrow allowing Perfunctory time for the Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Introduction to First Reading of Senate Bills.

  Senate Bill 135, offered by Representative Barnes and Tate,

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Bill First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 379, offered by Representative Hoicik. а Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Second (sic. First) Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 382. offered bv Representative Steczo. Bi 11 for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Rill. Senate Bi 11 403+ offered by Representative Peterson. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 458. offered by Representative Piel, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 461 • offered Representative Hensel, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to the law in relationship to Counties. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 466. offered by Representative Bill for an Act in relationship to Natural Resources Research Data Collection Environmental Studies. the Bill. Senate Bill 472, offered by Reading of Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 476 offered by Representative Countryman, Bill for an Act in relationship to Chattel Liens and Sale to Enforce Such Liens. First Reading of the Bill. Senate 481. offered by Representative Hensel, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to Counties. First the Bill. Senate Bill Reading o f 482. offered bу Representative McNamara, a Bill for an Act to amend an relationship to the Consolidation of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate **Bill** 486, offered by Representative Myron Olson and Flinn, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Department o f Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill.

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

Senate Bill 495, offered by Representative Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 557, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 582, offered by Representative Johnson, a Bill amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Act to Bill. Senate Bill 585. Reading ٥f the hv Representative Countryman and Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to First Reading of amend the Election Code. the Bill. Senate Bill 587, offered by Representative Holf and Tim Johnson. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Vacancies in Public Office. First Reading of the Continuing with Introduction of First Readings. Senate Bill 616, offered by Representative Berrios and Bugielski, a Bill for an Act to amend the Flection Code. First αf the Bille Senate Bill 637. offered bv Representative Petka, a Bill for an Act to amend the Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Election Code. First 639, offered by Representative Didrickson, a Bill for Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 642, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 644, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. of the Bill. Senate Bill 653, offered by First Reading Giorgi and Tim Johnson, a Bill for an Act Representative Election Code. (sic-First Reading of the amend the Bill; Senate Bill 670, offered by Representative Davis and LeFlore, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Chore Housekeeping Services for Disabled Persons. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 695, offered by Representative Preston, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Reading οf Bill. Senate Bill 752• offered hν Representative McNamara, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Low-level Radioactive Waste Management Act. First Reading n f the Bill. Senate Bill 759, offered Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act to the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. 677. offered Senate Bill hv Representative William a Bill for an Act concerning the Regulation ... Senate Bill 766. offered correction hv **William** a 3ill for an Act concerning the Regulation and Protection of Aquatic Life in Illinois. First Reading o f the Bill. Senate Bill 779, offered by Representative Piel, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 792, Act. offered Representative Berrios and Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Chemical Safety Act. First Senate Bill 904, offered by Representative Piel, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vietnam Veterans Reading οf the Bill. Senate Bill 906. offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for Act tο an amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Bill. Reading οf the Senate Bill 915, offered by Representative Piel, Act to amend the Sales Finance Agency Act. First Bill. Senate Bill 918, of the offered hν Piel, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to Representative provide for and regulate the Administration οf Trust First Reading of the Bill. Trust Companies. Senate Bill 922, offered by Representative Bernard Pederson. **Rill** Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Bill. Senate Bill 927. offered bν Representative Piel. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 928, offered by Representative Piel, a Bill Senate

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

for an Act to amend the Illinois **Banking** Act. First the Bill. Senate Bill 932, offered by Representative Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vital Records Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill offered by Representative Stange, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning Food (sic, Flood Plains. First Bill. of the Senate Bi 11 933, offered Representative Barnes, a Bill for an Act t o amend the Intergovernmental Missing Child Recovery Act. First Senate Bill 934. Reading of the Bill. offered bу Representative Myron Olson and Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of Senate Bill 936. offered by Representative the Bill. Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Barger, a Developmental Disability Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 942, offered by Representative Rice and Shaw, a an Act to amend the Funeral Directors and First Reading **Embalmers** Licensing Act. Bi11 945. offered by Representative Breslin and Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 950. the Bill. offered Reading αf hv Representative Barnes, a Bill for an Act to the Juvenile First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 955, Court Act. offered by Representative Preston, a Bill for Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities amend First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 973, offered Code. by Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend Hospital Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1012, offered by Representative Weaver, a Bill for an to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Act Senate Bill 1025, offered by Representative McNamara, for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1037, offered by Representative

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1040. Representative Barger, a Bill for an Act to amend an 'Act in relationship to County Zoning. First Reading of the 8111. Senate Bill 1046. offered by Representative Preston, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Rental Agreements. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1051, offered by Representative Levin and Countryman, Bi11 for an Act to repeal the Software License First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Enforcement Act. 1052, offered by Representative McGann, a Bill for an Act amend the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1073. offered bν Representative Bi 11 Stange. for an Act to repeal the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate 1095. offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading οf the Bill. Senate Bill 1119, offered by Representative Slater. an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Bi11 for First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1132. offered Representative Parke, а Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1183, offered by Representative Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1201, offered by Representative Ackerman, a Bi 11 amend the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 25 ... correction ... offered bν Representative William Peterson, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Species of Flora and Fauna. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1228, offered by Representative Slater and Hicks, Bil1 for an Act in relationship to the Conservation of Marginal

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Agricultural Land. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1266, offered by Representative McNamara, a Bill for Act to add to the Illinois Fairness in Lending Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1285. offered Piel, a Bill for an Act to amend the Representative Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1295, offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1296, offered bν Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused Neglected Child Reporting Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1320, offered bν Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1356, Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1410, offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to amend the Bill of Rights of Victims Witnesses of Violent Crime Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1472, offered by Representative McNamara, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Identification Card Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 1304, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1538 (sic - House 1538), a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Under Revenue, House Bills, Second Reading, House Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to Legalize and Validate Appropriations and Tax Levy Ordinances for Forest Preserve Districts. Second Reading of the Bill. Under State Regulations, House Bills, 1428, a Bill for an Act to amend the Reading, House Bi 11 Illinois Nursing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Bi11 1429 a Bill for an Act to amend the Physicians Assistance Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois House 8111 1430. Second Reading of Optometric Practice Act. the Rill. Bill 1431. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the Practice of Podiatry in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Administrators Licensing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act to amend the Psychologists Registration Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1435. a Bill for an Act to amend the Social Workers Registration Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act to amend Regulatory Agency Sunset Act. Second Reading of the the Rill. Order of Education, House Bills∙ Second Reading. House Bill 875, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Reading of the Bill. Under Special Order Government Initiatives, House Bills, Second Reading, Bi11 for an Act tο amend Act in relationship to Pre-trial Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Continuing, under House Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate, House Bill 676, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relationship to Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 919, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading Bill 2387, a Bill for an Act requiring House Fiscal Notes in relationship to Certain Bills. the Bill. House Bill 2510, a Bill for an Act Reading of relating to County Jails. Second Reading of the 8111. House Bill 2746+ a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to Counties. Second Reading of House Bill 2550. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Correction

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

that's House Bill 2850, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Continuing on Second Readings. House Bill 46, a Bill for an Act to amend the Humane Care for Animals Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 113, a Bill for an Act to require Reserved Seating for Certain Live Entertainment Performances. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 138, Bill for Act making appropriations to the Supreme Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 210, a Bill for an Act to limit Civil Liabilities. Second Reading House Bill 260, a Bill for the R111. an Act in relationship to the Purchase or Contract of Purchased Food Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill by State Agencies. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 426, a Bill for Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 482, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 483, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 515, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the House 8ill 555. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 609, relationship to the Sale of a Bill for an Act in Real Property by Stated Acreage. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 660, a Bill for an Act to amend Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 733, a Bill for an Act in relationship to County Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 770, a Zoning. Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Illinois Contingent Expenses of the Department of State Police. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 777, a Bill for

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Act Expense of the Department of Energy and Natural Reading of the Bill. House Bill 778, a Bill for an to make an appropriation for the Act Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Department of Central Management Second Reading of the Bill. Senate (sic, House) Services. Bill 783, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disability. Second Reading House Bill 784, a Bill for an Act to make of the Bill. appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 789. a Bill for an Act to appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent make an Expenses of the Department of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 791, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 792, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Department of Public Health. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 799. a Bill for Act making appropriations for an the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Continuing with Second Readings. House Bill 807. Bi11 amend an Act in relationship to Sheriffs an Act to Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill Bi11 for an Act to create the Illinois Negotiated Purchase Act. Second Reading of the Bill. HB...to create Purchase Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 811, a Bill Act. for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 818, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the House Bill 839, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

relationship Medical Center Commissions. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 852, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Bi11 864, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to Counties. Second Reading of Bill. House Bill 867, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Registration and Licensing of Motor Vehicles. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 876, a Rill an Act an appropriation to the Department making o f Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 884, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 924. Corrections. for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 936. a Bill for amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading Act of the Bill. House Bill 937, a Bill for an Act to Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 963, a Bill for an Act making appropriations t a Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 965, a Bill making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 969, a Bill for an Act to provide for Grants on Loans t o for the Purpose of Promoting Guality. Employers Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 992, a Bill for an Act amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 996, a Bill for an Act in relationship Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1007. a Holidays. Bill for an Act in relationship to the President of the Illinois State Labor Relations Board. Second Reading of House Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act to relation to the Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1024, a Bill for an

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Act in relationship to the founding and operation of the University of Illinois Hospital. Second Reading of the House Bill 1025, a Bill for an Act to amend in relation to the founding and operation of the University Illinois Hospital. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act to amend the **Environmental** Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill Protection Act. 1046, a Bill for an Act concerning township facilities Care and Treatment of the Mentally Retarded òr Developmentally Disabled. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1049, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Open Space Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi 11 1052, Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1078, a Bill for an Act in . relationship to Home Equity Living Plans. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 1082, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning Police Power upon the Sanitary District Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1095, of Chicago. Bill for an Act in relationship to the Sale or Lease of Real Estate within Flood Plains. Second Reading House Bill 1098, a Bill for an Act in relationship Bill. to State Employment. Second Reading of the Bill. House for an Act to amend certain Acts in Bi 11 1113 · a Bi11 Second Reading of the relationship to Jurors. Bill. House Bill 1114, a Bill for an Act regarding Counseling and for Mortgagors. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1132, a Bill Act. for an Act in relationship to Grand Juries. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1143, Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi 11 1144, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Council. Bill. House Bill 1157, a Bill for an Act Reading the appropriation making tο the Department an οf Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1159, a Bill an Act making for appropriations to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1162, a Affairs. Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1187, a Bill for an Act tο Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1202, a Bill for an Act appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the State Police Merit Board. Second Reading of the 1221. a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified House 8111 Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bi 11. House Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1232, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1240, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Telephone and Mail Harrassment. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1262, a Bill for amend the Workers Compensation Act. Second Reading of 1275, a the Bill. House Bill Bill for an Act making to the Attorney General. appropriations Second Reading of House Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act making the Bill. appropriations to the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act to in relationship to Criminal

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Identification and Investigation. Second Reading of the House Bill 1371, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. Second Reading of the House Bill 1392, a Bill for an Act to amend Act in relation to County Zoning. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1409, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the House Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi11 Bill for an Act to amend Civil 1444• a the Administrative Code ٥f Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1463, a Bill for Act to an Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1545, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1551, a Bill Code. Act to define the term combination when used in reference to a truck tractor. Second Reading of the Bi11 1559. Bil1 for an Act to amend Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning Hanagement of State Parks. Second Reading o f House Bill 1565, a Bill for an Act to amend an Bill. the Act concerning Corridors of Opportunity. Second Reading of House Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act to concerning Regional Tourism Councils. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act Illinois Vehicle Code. the Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1614, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1633, a Court Act. Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to County Zoning. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Housing Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

House Bill 1649, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1660, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading οf the Bill. House Bill 1666, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1670. a Bill for an Act in to the Reporting of Elder Abuse. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act to the the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the amend Bill. House Bill 1679, a Bill for an Act in relationship to State Moneys. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. been read a second time. House Bill 1696• a Bi 11 an to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. amend the House Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act to School 1 Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1706, a Bill Act to amend the State Attorneys Appellate Service Commission Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill an Act making an appropriation to the for Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1770, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to Counties. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1774, a House Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1790, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Science Foundation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1828. a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 1850, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading o f the Bill. House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

Practice Acta Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi11 for an Act to 1884. a Bill amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi 11 1896. Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1897, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Office of the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1900, a Rill for an Act concerning Administrators of Veterans\* Second Reading of the Bill. House 8111 Bill for an Act in relationship to Seizure and Forfeiture of Equipment. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1986. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1990, a Bill an Act to amend the Illinois Wage Payment Second Reading of the Bill. 2054, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2075. a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2099, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 2105, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2142, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2153. a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the a Bill Bill -House Bill 2174, for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2176, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill

50th Legislative Day

May 20. 1987

2241. a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2251, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2261, a to amend an Act in relationship to Rill for an Act Prisoners and Jailsa Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2262, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Code Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2267. for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2281, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the East St. Louis Area Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2284, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Homeowners Emergency Assistance Act. Second Reading of the House Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act to create the Riverfront Development Authority. Second Reading of House Bill 2289. a Bill for an Act to create the Enterprise High School Laboratory. Second Reading of Bill. House Bill 2315. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Coal and Energy Development Act. Second of the Bill. House Bill 2316, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2320, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the House Bill 2321, a Bill for an Act to amend Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act to amend an relationship to testing for AIDS. Second Reading of the House Bill 2373, a Bill for an Act in relationship to County Zoning. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act to amend the Weights and Measure Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Agricultural Licensing.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2398, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Environmental Protection Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2430. a Agency Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Public Health. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2438, a Bill for an concerning various procedure and notice requirements for Towing Operators. Second Reading of the Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2457, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2459, a Bill for an Act to amend Certain Acts in relationship to the expenditure of Second Reading of the Bill. Public Funds. House Bill Act to 2464. Ai 1 1 for an amend an Act creating the Illinois Department of Urban Development. Second Reading Bill. House Bill 2465, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second the Bill. House Bill 2466, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Homeowners Emergency Assistance Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2507. a Bill for an Act in buildings in municipalities. relationship ŧΛ certain House Bill 2540, a Bill for an Second Reading of the Bill. Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2569, a Bill for an Act to Freedom of Information Act. Second Reading of the House Bill 2572, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bill. the Code-Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill Criminal 2573, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Second Reading of the Bill. Procedure. House Bill 2578, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading Bill. House Bill 2587, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2592, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill Development Act. 2615. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2644, a Bill for an Act to Act creating a Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2678, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 2689, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois New Home Warranty and Builders Registration Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2710, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2711, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 2712, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2713, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2714, a Bill for an Act to the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the House Bill 2715, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2724, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code -Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2731, a Bill for an in relationship to the division of local governmental Act units into districts. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act to amend the Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of House Bill 2759, a Bill for an Act to amend the Rill. Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bi11 2767, a Bill for an Act to prohibit certain municipalities from utilizing quick-take procedures. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2787, a Bill for an Act creating the Public Transportation Safety Board Act.

50th Legislative Day

May 20, 1987

Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2819, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2825, a Bill for an Act in relationship to deceptive practices against the State. Second Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House will now stand adjourned."

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

HB-0034 THIRD READING	PAGE	20
HB-0046 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0093 THIRD READING	PAGE	201
HB-0097 RECALLED	PAGE	202
HB-0097 THIRD READING	PAGE	203
HB-0099 THIRD READING	PAGE	207
HB-0109 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0113 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0138 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0176 RECALLED	PAGE	25
HB-0176 THIRD READING	PAGE	26
HB-0192 THIRD READING	PAGE	29
HB-0210 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0260 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0294 THIRD READING	PAGE	140
HB-0295 THIRD READING	PAGE	151
HB-0308 THIRD READING	PAGE	305
HB-0330 THIRD READING	PAGE	30
HB-0331 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0378 THIRD READING	PAGE	208
HB-0389 THIRD READING	PAGE	158
HB-0410 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0416 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0421 RECALLED	PAGE	213
HB-0421 THIRD READING	PAGE	214
HB-0423 THIRD READING	PAGE	62
HB-0426 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0451 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
H3-0461 THIRD READING	PAGE	62
HB-0473 THIRD READING	PAGE	215
HB-0480 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0482 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0483 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0507 THIRD READING	PAGE	216
HB-0508 THIRD READING	PAGE	174
HB-0509 THIRD READING	PAGE	222
HB-0510 THIRD READING	PAGE	224
HB-0515 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0546 RECALLED	PAGE	178
HB-0546 THIRD READING	PAGE	180
HB-0547 RECALLED	PAGE	182
HB-0547 THIRD READING	PAGE	188
HB-0548 RECALLED HB-0548 THIRD READING	PAGE	189
HB-0549 THIRD READING	PAGE	191
HB-0555 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	227 331
HB-0606 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0609 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0655 RECALLED	PAGE	195
HB-0655 THIRD READING	PAGE	196
HB-0660 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0664 SECOND READING	PAGE	53
HB-0664 THIRD READING	PAGE	55
HB-0676 SECOND READING	PAGE	330
HB-0678 THIRD READING	PAGE	63
HB-0679 THIRD READING	PAGE	229
HB-0699 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0715 THIRD READING	PAGE	25 i
HB-0724 THIRD READING	PAGE	287
HB-0726 THIRD READING	PAGE	234
HB-0733 SECOND READING	PAGE	331
HB-0756 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0757 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0758 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0759 THIRD READING	PAGE	4

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

HB-0760 TH	IIRD READING	PAGE	4
	IRO READING	PAGE	4
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE Page	5 5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	COND READING	PAGE	331
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-0775 TH	IIRD READING	PAGE	5
	IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE	331
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	IIRD READING IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE PAGE	6 332
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	IRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	IRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE	332
HB-0792 SE	COND READING	PAGE	332
HB-0793 TH	IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	IIRD READING	PAGE	100
	COND READING COND READING	PAGE	332
	IRD READING	PAGE PAGE	332 235
	COND READING	PAGE	332
	IRD READING	PAGE	288
	IIRD READING	PAGE	294
HB-0852 SE	COND READING	PAGE	333
HB-0864 SE	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	330
	COND READING	PAGE	333
HB-0911 RE	COND READING	PAGE	333
	IIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	138 197
	COND READING	PAGE	330
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	333
HB-0937 SE	COND READING	PAGE	333
HB-0941 TH	IIRD READING	PAGE	298
	IIRD READING	PAGE	235
	IIRD READING	PAGE	6
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING HIRD READING	PAGE	333
	IIRD READING	PAGE Page	237 304
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	IRD READING	PAGE	198
	COND READING	PAGE	333
	COND READING	PAGE	333
HB-1014 TH	IRD READING	PAGE	12

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 3

HB-1024	SECOND READING	PAGE	333
HB-1025	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
HB-1033	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
HB-1035	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
HB-1046	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
HB-1049	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
HB-1052	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
HB-1063	THIRD READING	PAGE	306
	THIRD READING	PAGE	307
	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
	THIRD READING	PAGE	314
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	THIRD READING	PAGE	315
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE	334 334
	SECOND READING	PAGE Page	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	334
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
HB-1160	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
HB-1162	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
HB-1163	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	THIRD READING SECOND READING	PAGE	6 335
	SECOND READING	PAGE Page	335 329
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	SECOND READING	PAGE	329
	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
HB-1314	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
HB-1318	SECOND READING	PAGE	335
	THIRD READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	THIRD READING	PAGE	237
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE	329
	SECOND READING	PAGE Page	330 330
HB-1431		PAGE	330
HB-1433		PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
	RECALLED	PAGE	238
	THIRD READING	PAGE	241
	SECOND READING	PAGE	329
	SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1546	THIRD READING	PAGE	246

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 4

HB-1551 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1559 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1564 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1565 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1566 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1569 THIRD READING	PAGE	247
HB-1576 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1587 SECOND READING	PAGE	59
HB-1614 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1633 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1636 RECALLED	PAGE	32
HB-1636 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-1648 SECOND READING	PAGE	336
HB-1649 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1660 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1666 SECOND READING	PAGE	
		337
HB-1670 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1673 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1679 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1685 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-1691 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1696 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1702 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1706 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1723 THIRD READING	PAGE	199
HB-1731 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1770 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1774 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1779 SECOND READING	PAGE	
		61
HB-1781 THIRD READING	PAGE	127
HB-1790 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1791 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1805 SECOND READING	PAGE	36
HB-1805 RECALLED	PAGE	41
HB-1805 THIRD READING	PAGE	39
HB-1828 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1848 RECALLED	PAGE	13
HB-1848 THIRD READING	PAGE	14
HB-1850 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1868 THIRD READING	PAGE	200
HB-1871 SECOND READING	PAGE	337
HB-1884 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-1896 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-1897 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-1900 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
H8-1902 THIRD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1951 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-1954 THIRD READING	PAGE	59
HB-1969 THIRD READING	PAGE	250
HB-1986 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-1990 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2031 THIRD READING	PAGE	116
HB-2048 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-2049 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-2050 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-2054 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2075 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2084 RECALLED	PAGE	117
HB-2084 THIRD READING	PAGE	119
HB-2099 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2105 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2114 THIRD READING	PAGE	16
HB-2142 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2148 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
HB-2153 SECOND READING	PAGE	338
LISS GEOGRE REPORTED	FAGE	JJ0

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 5

HB-2174	SECOND READING	PAGE	338
	SECOND READING	PAGE	338
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	THIRD READING	PAGE	18
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
			125
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	SECOND READING	PAGE	339
	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2459	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2464	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2465	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2466	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2493	THIRD READING	PAGE	120
HB-2507	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2510	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
HB-2540	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2559	THIRD READING	PAGE	250
HB-2569	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2572	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2573	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2578	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2587	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2592	SECOND READING	PAGE	340
HB-2615	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2641	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2644	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2678	SECOND READING	PAGE	341 .
HB-2682	SECOND READING	PAGE	130
HB-2689	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2710	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2711	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2712	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2713	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2714	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2715	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
HB-2719	SECOND READING	PAGE	137
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	SECOND READING	PAGE	330
	THIRD READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	SECOND READING	PAGE	341
	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
		· ·	

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 6

MAY 20. 1987

HB-2804 SECOND READING	PAGE	342
HB-2810 RECALLED	PAGE	126
HB-2810 THIRD READING	PAGE	129
HB-2819 SECOND READING	PAGE	342
HB-2825 SECOND READING	PAGE	342
HB-2850 SECOND READING	PAGE	330
SB-0048 FIRST READING	PAGE	9
SB-0049 FIRST READING	PAGE	9
SB-0135 FIRST READING	PAGE	323
SB-0208 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0219 SECOND READING	PAGE	322
SB-0219 MOTION	PAGE	321
SB-0243 SECOND READING	PAGE	312
SB-0243 MOTION	PAGE	311
SB-0286 FIRST READING	PAGE	10
SB-0298 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0350 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0363 FIRST READING	PAGE	10
SB-0372 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0377 FIRST READING	PAGE	10
SB-0379 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0382 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0403 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0404 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0421 FIRST READING	PAGE	10
S8-0457 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0458 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0461 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0466 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0472 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0476 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0481 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0482 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0486 FIRST READING	PAGE	324
SB-0489 FIRST READING	PAGE	7
SB-0490 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0492 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0493 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0495 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0546 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0557 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0582 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0585 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0587 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0616 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0617 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0637 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0639 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0642 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0644 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0653 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
S8-0670 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0695 FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-0752 FIRST READING	PAGE	326
SB-0759 FIRST READING	PAGE	326
SB-0766 FIRST READING	PAGE	326
SB-0769 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0779 FIRST READING	PAGE	326
SB-0783 FIRST READING	PAGE	10
SB-0788 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0789 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0792 FIRST READING	PAGE	326
SB-0806 FIRST READING	PAGE	8
SB-0819 FIRST READING SB-0846 FIRST READING	PAGE	8 32 <b>7</b>
SB-0846 FIRST READING	PAGE	321

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 7

MAY 20, 1987

SB-0857	FIRST	READING	PAGE	8
SB-0904	FIRST	READING	PAGE	326
SB-0906			PAGE	326
SB-0915			PAGE	326
SB-0916			PAGE	8
SB-0918			PAGE	326
SB-0922			PAGE	326
SB-0927			PAGE	326
SB-0928			PAGE	326
SB-0932			PAGE	327
SB-0933			PAGE	327
SB-0934			PAGE	327
SB-0936				327
SB-0942		READING	PAGE	327
SB-0945			PAGE	327
SB-0949			PAGE	8
SB-0950			PAGE	327
SB-0955			PAGE	327
SB-0958			PAGE	8
SB-0959			PAGE	9
SB-0960			PAGE	9
\$8-0961			PAGE	9
SB-0973				327
SB-1006			PAGE	9
SB-1012				327
SB-1025				327
SB-1037				327
SB-1040	-			328
SB-1046				328
SB-1051		READING		328
\$8-1052				328
SB-1073			PAGE	328
SB-1085				313
SB-1119		READING	_	328
SB-1132			PAGE	328
SB-1156			PAGE	328
SB-1172			PAGE	9
58-1183			PAGE	-
SB-1201			PAGE Page	328 328
SB-1225			PAGE	328
SB-1228			PAGE	328
SB-1233			PAGE	9
SB-1266		READING		329
SB-1285				329
SB-1295				329
SB-1296		READING	PAGE	329
SB-1304			PAGE	9
SB-1320		READING		32 9
58-1356				329
SB-1379			PAGE	9
SB-1410		READING		32 9
SB-1461			PAGE	9
SB-1472		READING		32 9
SB-1493			PAGE	, 9
SB-1494			PAGE	9

### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER- REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER-REVEREND BRADY	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	3

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 8

MAY 20, 1987

### SUBJECT MATTER

APPROPRIATIONS CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE	PAGE	36
APPROPRIATIONS CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED	PAGE	174
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	323
PERFUNCTORY ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	342